

regrettably wide. But I take pride in saying that, in our case, the reforms were implemented with considerable success almost from the start, sweeping the small power-elite from domination and speeding Iran on the road to membership with the more advanced industrial nations.

Along with success in social reforms, there have been phenomenal gains in the implementation of our development programs. In 1965, the Gross National Product in Iran rose by 11.9%, and, in 1966, by 9.5%—in both cases one of the highest in the world. Last year industrial investment rose by 16%. Whereas, in 1953, our total imports amounted to only \$115-million, in 1966 it reached almost one billion.

The prosperity and stability thus gained, coupled with fantastic potentials, have gone a long way to attracting a great inflow of tourists and of foreign capital to Iran.

For all this the Iranian nation owes a debt of gratitude to the initiative and farsighted-

ness of its dynamic leader. His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran, who declared a long time ago that to reign over a land beset with poverty and illiteracy is no source of pride or satisfaction. The Shahanshah set the revolutionary goals before the nation in the national referendum of January 26, 1963. Said he, and I quote:

"We set ourselves to accomplish far-reaching social reforms, economic reconstruction commensurate with democratic ideals, development of education, international cooperation and respect for moral beliefs, as well as individual and social freedom."

The revolution can now be examined not simply for the goals promised in the first flush of enthusiasm, but for what has actually been accomplished. The present Exhibit is thus brought to you not only to illustrate seventy centuries of Iran's history, rich heritage and culture, but also to portray her achievements of the past decade. The work ahead is still vast, allowing for no compla-

gency; but what has been accomplished is most encouraging and, to all of us, highly rewarding.

Before concluding, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, as well as to the distinguished President and members of the Board of Directors of the Iran-American Society, for their kindness in arranging the Exhibit and for their wholehearted support and invaluable contribution toward better understanding and closer cultural ties between Iran and the United States.

I now take pleasure in inviting you all to view the Exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran is respected and admired not only by his countrymen, but the entire world and is a beacon of light in the Middle East.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.—Isaiah 40: 31.

Our Father in heaven and on earth, we, the representatives of the people of our land, bow before Thee humbly praying for strength, for guidance, and for good will from Thee. Make this a sacred moment in which we become aware of Thy presence, a moment when strength is given, guidance provided, and good will arises anew within us.

We need Thee, every hour we need Thee. We hurry too much, we eat too fast, we sleep too little, and then wonder why we are weary and worried and worn out. As we wait upon Thee renew our strength, restore our spirits, reinvigorate our minds, that this day we may think good thoughts, make wise decisions, and do it all free from tension and filled with faith. Trusting in Thee, may we sing even in the rain. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana the program for the remainder of this week and the agenda for next.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. In response to the request of the distinguished minority lead-

er, the program for today has previously been announced, as the Members know, as the bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

Upon conclusion of the consideration of that legislation the House will adjourn until Monday next, permission having been granted on yesterday, upon the request of the majority leader.

On Monday we have a very heavy calendar and, I might say, we have had very heavy legislative business on Mondays for the past month or so. On Monday we will have the Consent Calendar.

There are seven suspensions scheduled:

H.R. 4903, to provide for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

S. 223, to authorize the disposal of Government-owned long-lines communications facilities in the State of Alaska;

H.R. 5943, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 9796, to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence;

H.R. 4772, to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct initiation of allotments of pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 11767, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust legislative jurisdiction of the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910, to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy.

On Tuesday and Wednesday: Tuesday is Private Calendar day; to be followed by House Joint Resolution 853, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968; S. 676, obstruction of criminal investigations, to be considered under open rule, with 1 hour of debate; and H.R. 1411, false representations by mail, also with an open rule and 1 hour to debate.

On Thursday and Friday of next week there are Jewish holidays, and we have not scheduled any business for those 2 days.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman from Louisiana, the acting majority leader, think we will get the conference report on the public works bill next week?

Mr. BOGGS. I think so. I think the conference report has been agreed to. Of course, that is the military construction conference report. I do not know about the public works bill generally. As the gentleman knows, however, conference reports are always in order.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

L. T. "TEX" EASLEY RETIRING

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, after 30 years of service with the Associated Press, L. T. "Tex" Easley is retiring. During my years here in Washington, I have come to know Tex and his lovely wife, Bonita, as neighbors and friends, as well as by my association with him here on Capitol Hill.

Tex embodies the very highest moral and ethical standards and is an outstanding example of a responsible reporter.

While I am aware that his "retirement" will consist of hard work, I wish him every success in his new endeavor and look forward to many more years of pleasant association with him.

GOV. FARRIS BRYANT LEAVING OEP

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES, Mr. Speaker, Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, is going home to Florida. For 18 months he has rendered distinguished service as one of the strong forces in the Executive Office of the President. Those of us who have known Farris through the years, and watched his dedicated work in the Florida Legislature, followed by his outstanding services as Governor of our State, expected no less than an equally outstanding performance in Washington.

Governor Bryant is a man who has a deep faith in the vitality of America's legislative processes and a dedication to the principles of constitutional government. He leaves Washington to return to his professional and business interests with increased stature and with a wider circle of friends who admire his qualities and contributions.

SUPPORTING THE MARINES IN CONTHIEN

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today over a battalion of our Marines are under attack on three sides on the Conthien Salient. I strongly urge that the strength of the United States be placed behind these men who for days have undergone heavy, unrelenting, incessant bombardment and vicious attacks.

Such action as is necessary to save every life possible must be taken. While I do not support the policy which placed our men there, I do and will continue to support them.

The seriousness of the situation in the I Corps area is such as to require immediate action and our fervent, heartfelt prayers.

M-16 RIFLE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I received direct firsthand confirmation of some additional sorry facts about the M-16 rifle mess in Vietnam.

First, hard-pressed marines in the thick of fighting still did not have guns retrofitted with the new buffer assembly as of September 16.

Early in August the Congress was told by Defense officials that a sufficient supply of the new parts had been produced to equip all guns in combat service.

Manufacture of the buffer assemblies had begun last December, when it was clear that ball-type ammunition still used in the M-16's causes such an increase in rate of fire as to result in frequent gun failure.

In my view, failure of the Defense Department to retrofit all M-16 rifles in combat service long ago is absolutely scandalous. Because of this failure marines in Vietnam go into combat duty without dependable rifles.

Second, these same hard-pressed marines, then serving on Hill 52 in Vietnam, were ordered to lie about the performance of the M-16 rifle when an official inspection team believed to have included several Congressmen, visited the area in early June of this year.

All of them felt compelled to follow orders and did actually lie, telling the inspectors the gun worked fine even after it had been fired for several thousand rounds. Actually, in at least one case, a marine had been able to get less than 300 rounds through the gun and the experience of others had been even worse.

Congress should probe deeply enough to fix precisely the blame for the orders to lie, and for the failure to get all combat weapons retrofitted promptly.

This is an unconscionable outrage, and some heads should roll.

WHAT IS SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE IS SAUCE FOR THE GANDER

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I read in the press that the University of Virginia had asked the Prime Minister of Rhodesia to come there to make a speech, and it was suggested that he would not be granted a visa. I have taken this matter up with the State Department. I do not necessarily agree with the Prime Minister of Rhodesia on his position, but I do think he has a right to express his opinion. I have told the State Department that if they do not give him a visa, I would like to have them come before my subcommittee and explain why they would give a passport to Stokely Carmichael but not a visa to Ian Smith.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 286]

Abbitt	Anderson, Ill.	Arends
Abernethy	Anderson, Tenn.	Ashley
Adams	Andrews, Ala.	Aspinall
Addabbo	Annunzio	Barrett
Albert		Belcher

Bevill	Hall	Price, Tex.
Blester	Halleck	Pucinski
Bingham	Halpern	Quillen
Blanton	Hammer-	Rarick
Brademas	schmidt	Rees
Brock	Hanna	Reifel
Brown, Ohio	Harrison	Resnick
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	Reuss
Bush	Hathaway	Rivers
Button	Heckler, Mass.	Ronan
Byrnes, Wis.	Helstoski	Rooney, Pa.
Cahill	Henderson	Rosenthal
Casey	Holland	Roudebush
Celler	Hosmer	Roush
Clark	Ichord	Sandman
Clausen,	Jacobs	St Germain
Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Schadeberg
Cleveland	Jones, N.C.	Scherle
Collier	Karth	Selden
Colmer	Kazen	Shriver
Corman	Keith	Slack
Cowger	Kelly	Smith, Iowa
Curtis	King, N.Y.	Stafford
Davis, Wis.	Kirwan	Staggers
Dawson	Kluczyński	Steed
de la Garza	Kornegay	Steiger, Ariz.
Delaney	Kupferman	Stratton
Dent	Kuykendall	Stubblefield
Derwinski	Kyl	Sullivan
Devine	Landrum	Taft
Diggs	Lennon	Taylor
Dulski	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, La.	McCarthy	Thomson, Wis.
Eilberg	McCulloch	Tiernan
Eshleman	Macdonald,	Tunney
Everett	Mass.	Utt
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Waggoner
Fallon	Mathias, Md.	Wampler
Farbstein	Meskill	Watkins
Feighan	Michel	Watson
Fino	Mink	Whalen
Ford,	Minshall	Whalley
William D.	Mize	Whitten
Fountain	Moorhead	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Morgan	Wiggins
Fulton, Tenn.	Morse, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
Fuqua	Morton	Williams, Pa.
Galifianakis	Moss	Willis
Gallagher	Multer	Wilson, Bob
Gardner	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolf
Garmatz	Nedzi	Wyatt
Gilbert	Nelsen	Wylder
Goodell	Nix	Wylie
Gray	O'Hara, Mich.	Wyman
Green, Pa.	O'Konski	Yates
Griffiths	Ottinger	Zion
Grover	Pike	Zwach
Gurney	Poff	
Hagan	Pool	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 247 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ATTENDANCE IN THE HOUSE ON FRIDAYS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that several days ago 28 Members of the House of Representatives addressed a letter to the Speaker complaining about the fact that we do not have business on Fridays. I think today's rollcall will indicate that almost one-half the men who signed this letter addressed to the Speaker are not present today. I think something ought to be done about it.

Of the 28 signers of this letter urging Friday and Saturday sessions, the following 12 are absent today: Hon. WILLIAM O. COWGER, Hon. DAN KUYKENDALL, Hon. GEORGE BUSH, Hon. EDWARD BIESTER, Hon. JOHN ZWACH, Hon. BOB PRICE, Hon. CHARLES SANDMAN, Hon. ROGER ZION, Hon.

MARGARET HECKLER, Hon. CHARLES WHALEN, Hon. SAM STEIGER, and Hon. CHALMERS WYLIE.

If the House of Representatives' records are further checked, they will reveal that several of the signers of this letter have among the worst attendance records in the Congress.

AMENDMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 921 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 921

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 921 provides for a 1 hour open rule, making in order consideration of H.R. 10673, to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended.

To the best of my knowledge there is no opposition whatsoever to the rule and very little, if any, to the legislation itself.

I therefore reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Missouri.

This resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of debate. The purposes of the bill are: First, to make clear that a stockyard owner has the responsibility and right to manage his stockyard in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner; second, to require persons operating at the stockyard to conduct their operations in a manner which will foster, preserve, and insure an efficient, competitive public market. The bill expressly provides that no person can engage in business at the stockyard as a market agency or a dealer unless the stockyard owner has determined that his services will be beneficial to the business and welfare of the stockyard and its patrons and customers. It would relieve the stockyard owner or market agency of a duty to furnish stockyard services to all persons upon reasonable request without discrimination, but would provide that

all stockyard services furnished pursuant to reasonable request at a stockyard must be reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

The Packers and Stockyards Act was enacted in 1921 in response to flagrant and deceptive practices in the livestock and meat industries, including the monopolistic control of livestock marketing facilities through ownership and control of the facilities by several large packing firms. The Congress passed the act, setting up a system of regulation, based on the principle that the major terminal stockyards were monopolies and should be treated as "great national public utilities" whose existence and function was essential to the flow of commerce.

However, major changes have taken place in the livestock industry since the enactment of the Packers and Stockyards Act: First, the terminal markets—where livestock is sold after negotiations between commission sellers and buyers, and the stockyard owner provides the facilities and certain services, and the actual selling is done by the commission sellers—are no longer in a monopolistic position because they are surrounded by 2,200 auction markets and thousands of packer and dealer buying stations; second, today most of the packing plants are located throughout the country areas away from the terminal markets. In these circumstances, it is necessary that stockyard owners exercise such management and control over their stockyards and the persons operating thereon that they are able to preserve and maintain an efficient, competitive market.

This bill applies to terminal stockyards and auction markets. The question of stockyard owners' rights, however, has arisen primarily at terminal markets. At an auction market there is no question about the right of the auction operator to manage and regulate the market.

The need for the terminal stockyard owner to have clearcut authority to manage the stockyard arises from the fact that the stockyard owner provides the facilities, while the actual selling is done by the commission firms. Some stockyard owners have investments exceeding \$15 million. The commission firms at a terminal market are, in effect, the selling arm of the stockyard. The stockyard company's existence is dependent upon the ability of the commission firms at the stockyards to obtain consignments to the market. If the firms at the stockyard do not support the market, and the stockyard owner has no control over this matter, the stockyard owner can be forced to close his business.

Most market agencies selling livestock at terminal stockyards conduct their activities in a manner which will foster, preserve, and insure an efficient, competitive public market. Others, however, engage in practices which are not in the best interests of the market or patrons of the market.

Also, some commission firms engaged in business at terminal stockyards exert more effort in getting shippers and buyers to bypass the stockyards than they exert in getting business to be handled at the stockyards.

The Department of Agriculture believes that the enactment of the pro-

posed legislation with the amendments proposed will clarify and extend the authority of stockyard owners in a manner which will be beneficial to the livestock industry, while preserving the right of the Secretary to prevent an abuse of such authority.

The enactment of this proposed bill would not require any additional funds for its enforcement.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10673, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, if there are any questions with respect to this measure, I am sure that the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], or I or any one of the members of the committee present, will be glad to answer them.

Mr. Chairman, the primary purpose of this bill is to make clear that a stockyard owner has the responsibility and right to manage his stockyard in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner, and to require persons operating at the stockyard to conduct their operation in a manner which will foster, preserve, and insure an efficient and competitive market. It preserves to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to prevent any abuse of authority by the stockyard with respect to the exercise of any of the rights that this bill gives.

This bill relieves the stockyard owner or market agency of a duty to furnish stockyard services to all persons merely because they request such services. This is a change to the present law, and is necessitated as part of the attempt here to get away from the outdated concept that these terminal stockyards are "great national public utilities." This bill provides that no person can engage in business at a stockyard as a market agency or a dealer unless first, the stockyard owner has determined that his services will be beneficial to the business and welfare of the stockyard and its patrons and customers, and second, that this de-

termination is not unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory.

Mr. Chairman, the purposes of this bill, and the necessity for its passage, can best be understood in terms of the effect of the changing times on this vital industry.

Fifty years ago, the great terminal markets existed in an attitude of near monopoly. There were abuses of power by several large packing firms. The abuses included the monopolistic control of livestock marketing facilities. In response to these and other flagrant and deceptive practices, Congress passed the present Packers and Stockyards Act, which declared that the major terminal stockyards were monopolies and should be treated as "great national public utilities."

A terminal market sells livestock by negotiation between commission sellers and buyers. The stockyards owner provides the facilities and certain services, and the actual selling is done by the commission sellers. This type of operation is different from auction stockyards, where one person or firm operates the facilities selling livestock at public auction to the highest bidder, although today many terminal markets also sell a considerable volume of livestock at auction on certain days of the week.

The passage of time has not treated these institutions kindly. From their former powerful position, the terminal markets have fallen far. Today these markets are surrounded by approximately 2,200 auction markets and thousands of packers and dealer buying stations. Today, packers buy substantially more livestock directly from producers or others than from terminal markets. The percentage of federally inspected slaughter cattle bought at terminal markets has declined from 91 percent in 1925 to 34 percent in 1965. During the same period, sales of slaughter hogs have dropped from 82 to 26 percent.

Mr. Chairman, successful operation of a terminal stockyard comes about from a blending of the facilities and certain services provided by a stockyard owner, and the actual selling of livestock, which is handled by commission firms. Customarily, the stockyard owner will provide free space to commission firms, and his income is dependent upon yardage charges collected upon the livestock sold by these commission firms. The commission firms are, in effect, the selling arm of the stockyard. The continued existence of the stockyard is dependent on the ability of the commission firms at the stockyards to obtain consignments to the market.

It is readily obvious, then, that the little business remaining to the terminal markets is seriously jeopardized by any unscrupulous practices in which commission firms might be engaged.

While the great majority of commission merchants are honest and reliable, testimony before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains of the House Committee on Agriculture revealed that some commission firms are actually exerting more effort to convince shippers and buyers to do business away from the

stockyard than in getting business to be handled there.

In addition, some commission men do not properly represent the best interests of the shippers. They may have another occupation, which prevents them from giving their fullest effort toward sales in the stockyard. Firms such as these are often disinterested and/or inefficient, and these attitudes result in a poor reputation for the stockyard, as well as for other commission firms which deal there.

To prevent recurrence of the abuses I have mentioned, commission men at a stockyard have sometimes attempted to form themselves into livestock exchanges, which are organizations of commission men at a terminal market. In addition to the other values and benefits which accrue to such an organization, often enough the exchange will attempt to provide a source of regulations designed to foster better and more scrupulous practices at the market. However, because the membership in the exchange is only voluntary, control is gained only over those commission firms and individuals who choose to belong. The common interpretation of the present law is that the commission firm which chooses not to belong to the exchange is free to continue in any harmful practices it may choose without fear of regulation. Thus, these associations are virtually powerless to relieve this most obvious problem in the terminal markets, this situation is serious, indeed.

The logical answer to the problems would be to specifically alter the present Packers and Stockyards Act to give the terminal market owner the power to enforce reasonable restrictions designed to provide for more efficient marketing at his place of business, and to give a more binding effect upon any regulations adopted by the organizations of commission men who work at the stockyard.

This is the purpose of this legislation. This bill would provide the necessary power to the stockyard owner to regulate the matters I have been discussing. The stockyard owner would be authorized to regulate or refuse to furnish facilities and services to a firm which is not furthering the interests of the market, subject to the Secretary of Agriculture's supervision. The owner would also be authorized by the bill to regulate any other matter at the stockyard which is appropriate to foster, preserve, or insure an efficient, competitive public market, practices, for example, such as a centralized computerized bookkeeping and paying system would be allowed under this legislation. This could replace many separate accounting systems, thereby leading to reduced marketing cost.

Presently, stockyard owners are afraid to put such practices into operation, because the ability of the stockyard owner to regulate even these normal activities is open to question. There is a great degree of uncertainty as to whether or not these owners can take many actions that might normally appear appropriate to a businessman, without laying themselves open to money damages for exceeding their authority. The bill would provide reasonable guidelines which owner and

commission agent alike could rely on in the conduct of their business.

There is broad general support for this bill. The Committee on Agriculture realized that the present law creates a hardship, not only for the stockyard owner and commission agent, but for the buyers and the livestock industry as a whole. Both my learned colleagues, the gracious gentlewoman from Washington, and myself were members of the National Commission on Food Marketing which unanimously recommended the enactment of clarifying legislation in this murky area. The Department of Agriculture also strongly favors the enactment of this bill.

Initially, there was some question as to whether or not this bill conflicted with the holding of the Supreme Court in *Denver Union Stockyard Company v. Producers Livestock Marketing Association* (356 U.S. 282), where the Court held that the present Packers and Stockyards Act does not permit a stockyard owner to prevent a commission man, engaged in his stockyard, from also engaging in business at another regulated stockyard. This is not the intent of the bill, but neither is there here any intent to broaden the scope of the Denver case beyond the limited scope set forth in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, the stockyards of today are sad reflections of the thriving institution of half a century ago. The small percentage of livestock business that the terminal markets are now receiving has placed them in an economically vulnerable situation. Since 1921, the percentage of slaughter livestock being processed through these markets has been steadily declining, and the trend is expected to continue unless, and perhaps even if, we act favorably on this bill. There is no longer a need for regulation of the stockyards as monopolies and only Congress can provide the necessary surgery to give stockyard owners the reasonable right to mind their own businesses, commission merchants the right to seek compliance with reasonable regulations made by them for better conduct of their business, and the livestock industry the right to except reasonably efficient marketing practices which can achieve the best price to the buyer for his product.

Presently, should the owner of the stockyard attempt to make his stockyards more efficient in operation through regulation of the matters I have mentioned, he is treading in an area where liability and monetary damages can spring up against him at any moment. Serious questions of interpretation have not only "muddied the water" in this area, but have also rendered many stockyard owners simply afraid to act.

The Denver Stockyards case, which I mentioned previously, the Court said:

We are told, however, that the economics of the business has changed, that while at the passage of the act most livestock purchases were at these stockyards, now a substantial portion, about 40 percent, it is said, takes place at private livestock markets such as feed yards and country points. * * * If the Packers and Stockyards Act does not fit the present economics of the business, a problem is presented for the Congress (p. 289).

Mr. Chairman, the present situation facing these terminal stockyards, as stated by the Supreme Court, represents a mandate on us to act. We must act now to avoid further hardship to this industry. The present Packers and Stockyards Act does not fit the present economics of the business.

In summation, then, passage of this bill is vitally needed. Its enactment would cost nothing. It has broad support. It is good legislation and was thoroughly examined. I urge its favorable consideration here.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10673, a bill to strengthen and clarify stockyard owners' rights and responsibilities with respect to the management of their stockyards.

The Packers and Stockyards Act, passed by Congress and enacted in 1921, set up a system of regulation of terminal livestock markets based on the principle that they were monopolies and should be treated as "great national public utilities." At that time, most of the livestock sold passed through these terminal markets, but today they are no longer in a monopolistic position. Auction markets and packer and dealer buying stations now receive most of the livestock sold.

For example, in 1925, nine out of 10 federally inspected slaughter cattle were bought at terminal markets, but, in 1965, the number had dropped to a little over three out of 10. The comparable decline in slaughter hogs has been from three out of four in 1925 to less than one out of four in 1965. For sheep, the decline has been from eight out of 10 in 1925 to about one out of four in 1965.

At these 50-some terminal markets, the stockyard owner provides the facilities, while the actual selling is done by commission firms. The stockyard owner furnishes free pen space to the commission firms, and the stockyard owner's revenue is dependent upon the yardage charges collected upon the livestock sold by these firms.

Testimony developed in hearings held before our Livestock and Grains Subcommittee in June revealed that some commission firms are actually using the free pen space and facilities provided to solicit business away from the stockyards. Sometimes it seems they work harder at getting business away from the stockyards than to them.

Not only is this practice unfair, but it decreases business at the stockyards and increases operating costs, making it more expensive to handle livestock there. This, in turn, is reflected in higher costs of livestock to the buyers and eventually to the consumers—while at the same time tending to lower the prices received by the producers.

The basic and fundamental thrust of the legislation before us today is to permit owners of these terminal market stockyards to issue regulations that would prohibit agencies using their free facilities from soliciting business for their competitors.

Mr. Chairman, this change seems altogether fair and reasonable. One of the

witnesses testifying before our subcommittee made what seems to me an especially appropriate analogy. He said:

We feel that frequently we are in the same position, let us say, as a depot, a train station down here where the airline puts a man in the lobby who contacts every potential customer who comes in to buy a railroad ticket and they say "We can fly you faster and cheaper and more comfortably—come out and do business with us." I do not think that the railroads would put up with that very long. I do not think that we should have to put with a comparable situation.

It is important to keep in mind that while the bill would make these needed changes with respect to the stockyard owners' right to manage his facility, it would also preserve to the Secretary of Agriculture the right under the Packers and Stockyards Act to prevent the abuse of authority by the owner. The basic regulatory authority under the Packers and Stockyards Act would remain unchanged.

Last year the National Commission on Food Marketing, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and I were members, filed its comprehensive report on the structure and performance of the Nation's food marketing system with the President and the Congress. In that report, we pointed out, and I am quoting:

Generally, the stockyards section of the act is considered to be a valuable service to producers and the industry. However, changes in marketing methods for livestock have raised some questions about the restrictions the act puts upon the competitive strength of terminal markets.

In the past few years, direct buying and auction markets have diverted substantial amounts of livestock from the terminal markets. Attempts by terminal owners to meet declining volumes by reducing the number of market agencies on the terminal have been met with the claim that the act requires the terminal to accept all who wish to stay. Although the question is unresolved, it seems clear that such a requirement would make it difficult for the terminal owner to adjust to economic change. The terminal markets' loss of almost complete control of livestock marketing may warrant a new look at regulations of terminal markets not imposed on other marketing channels.

On the basis of our investigation in this area, the Commission made this unanimous recommendation, and again I quote:

Terminal markets for livestock are still the focal points of livestock trading in many areas, play an important role in all pricing, and are especially important sales outlets for smaller producers. In order that these markets have every opportunity to serve the changing needs of the livestock industry, and in view of increased competition from other marketing methods, the Packers and Stockyards Act should be administered, and if necessary amended, to give stockyard owners and marketing agencies the greatest flexibility and control over their operations consistent with protecting the interests of buyers and sellers.

I might just add that this was one of the few noncontroversial recommendations made by the Commission.

Our 18 months of study clearly demonstrated to the members of the Commission that legislation of the type before us today is necessary and justified by the major changes which have taken place

in the livestock marketing industry, and especially in the terminal markets, since the passage of the original Packers and Stockyards Act 46 years ago in 1921.

I think it is also interesting to note that in one sense, the National Food Marketing Commission's recommendation is quite unique. This group was created by Congress, and established as an official governmental factfinding body—yet it has proposed in this instance a movement away from greater Federal control and toward allowing private enterprise more flexibility in management and decisionmaking. I hope this will be a contagious move.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is both necessary and desirable, and will have a beneficial effect upon the industry. I was one of those who originally introduced this bill, and it has strong bipartisan support in the Agriculture Committee, as evidenced by the final vote of approval—21 to 3.

I hope my colleagues here this afternoon will also give it their approval.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE] such time as he may consume.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding.

I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the intent of this legislation and to ask certain questions of the distinguished gentleman from Texas who is the author of the bill and who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains, which considered the bill and which conducted hearings thereon, and who is handling the bill today and, also, I would like to address this question to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and who is handling the bill today for the minority.

I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Washington if she agrees that the testimony at the hearings by Deputy Assistant Secretary Rodney E. Leonard, of the Department of Agriculture, by Acting Administrator Donald A. Campbell of the Packers and Stockyards Administration, and also the testimony by President Bennett of the Union Stock Yards Corp. and President Jennings of the American Stockyards Association, and by all other witnesses, all established the fact that the Sioux City Livestock Exchange is a strong and vigorous association of commission men doing business at the Sioux City stockyards and who do a good job of policing their own members?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYNE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MAYNE] that this was certainly made clear by all witnesses. They testified to the effect that the Sioux City market is working well and that it is not experiencing any trouble. I think we might point out for the record that members of the Committee can find testimony to that effect in the hearings at page 17,

lines 4 and 5, which in my opinion is a very good quote. They also testified to the effect that as far as they were concerned they do not need this legislation in Sioux City. I further recall the fact that the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Mr. Leonard, testified that the relationships between the owner of the stockyards and the commission men at Sioux City have been good and that he did not believe this legislation would change that relationship significantly.

I might say that is on page 12, the last 10 lines of our hearing testimony.

Then President Jennings of the American Stockyards Association also testified to the very good job the commission firms are doing in the Sioux City Livestock Exchange, and also testified to the fact that they would not be affected at all by this bill.

Mr. MAYNE. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if it is also her intention, and the intention of the committee, that this bill should not change this present existing relationship at Sioux City, and should not affect the situation there?

Mrs. MAY. That is certainly my intention, and I believe it is the intention of the committee.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if I might direct this question to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge PURCELL, who is the author of the bill, and floor manager of the bill, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill. I will ask the gentleman from Texas if he believes that this bill is aimed at the situation in Sioux City, and the other river markets?

Mr. PURCELL. I will say to the gentleman that the bill definitely is not aimed toward the situation in Sioux City, and I will assure the gentleman from Iowa that it is not the intention of the committee that the situation at Sioux City be changed by this bill in any way.

Mr. MAYNE. Does the gentleman agree with me, and also with the gentleman from Washington, that the testimony at the hearing was that the Sioux City Livestock Exchange is doing a good job of policing its own members, that the Sioux City market is working well, and that the bill is unnecessary as far as Sioux City is concerned?

Mr. PURCELL. I do so agree. I would say that the Sioux City market and other markets in the river areas in the general area of Sioux City really are more or less a model for permanent marketing problems, and it is more in the other areas of the country that this bill is really needed.

Mr. MAYNE. I wonder if the gentleman could give us some specific examples of situations in which it would be reasonable for stockyards to take action to deny commission firms the use of the yards under the intention of this bill?

Mr. PURCELL. I will be glad to. We had testimony describing a firm which consisted of one man who was really a painter, as I remember, and who spent most of his time painting. There was another example given of a tollkeeper on a bridge, and this man seemed to spend most of his time keeping the bridge, and not being available for duty as a com-

mission man. The major problem is that this type of individual hurts the stockyards because they are not really interested in fostering a good livestock market. It is only when a firm degenerates to the point where they are hurting the reputation of the stockyard itself in selling livestock that there would be any reason for the owner not to want a commission firm or a selling firm to continue on that yard.

Mr. MAYNE. Are these the types of situations which the bill is intended to affect which the gentleman has just related to the Committee?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes. Those examples that we have given, and other similar ones, are the reasons that this bill is thought to be necessary.

Mr. MAYNE. I would further ask the gentleman is it intended by the Agriculture Committee that this bill should give a stockyard owner complete control over market agencies on the yard with absolute and complete discretion as to who can operate on that yard?

Mr. PURCELL. That is not the intent of the committee or of this legislation. It is intended that the owner shall be required to furnish stockyard services on a fair, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory basis. If a commission firm feels that it has been treated unreasonably, it can bring a complaint to the Secretary of Agriculture, who will investigate the complaint and take appropriate action if he finds a basis for the complaint.

Mr. MAYNE. Referring to the testimony of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Rodney E. Leonard, who appeared before the subcommittee, I will ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he recalls Mr. Leonard's testimony that where there is an association of commission firms which is actually functioning and policing its own members, such as the Sioux City Livestock Exchange, then the Department would consider that the stockyards owner should consult with the association or exchange before revoking the authorization of any firm to operate on that particular market?

And I believe that testimony appears at page 23, lines 34 to 45 of the hearing transcript.

Does the gentleman recall that testimony?

Mr. PURCELL. I do distinctly remember that testimony, and this is my understanding of the intent of this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. MAYNE. And I believe Mr. Leonard further stated that he would have no objection to having a safeguard actually written into this law providing that the stockyards owner would be required to consult with the livestock exchange or association at a market before revoking the authorization of any firm to operate on that market?

Mr. PURCELL. That is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. In order to further clarify the congressional intent in passing this bill, I would ask the gentleman if it is his intention and the intention of the committee that if this bill is passed, it would be considered unreasonable within the meaning of the act for a stockyards company to take any action

against any market agency as defined in the act without first consulting with the livestock exchange or association at the market where such agency was doing business?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes, such is my intention and I believe it to be the intention of the committee.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas and to the chairman that I have received the following letter dated September 28, 1967, from Deputy Assistant Secretary Leonard which further clarifies the position of the Department of Agriculture with reference to this bill and which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1967.
Hon. WILEY MAYNE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MAYNE: During the hearing before the Subcommittee on Livestock and Grain relating to H.R. 6231, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, there was a discussion relating to stockyard owners consulting with the livestock exchange before taking action affecting a particular commission firm.

To amplify our views, we have frequently urged stockyard owners to consult with the livestock exchange and other groups engaged in business at a terminal stockyard before promulgating regulations or taking significant action which affects the persons engaged in business at the stockyard. We have stated to stockyard owners that, irrespective of their authority to take unilateral action, the success of the stockyard is dependent upon cooperation and harmonious relations between the stockyard owner and the persons engaged in business at the stockyard. Frequent exchange of views is, therefore, vital to a successful stockyard.

The stockyard owners have expressed an agreement with our views, in this respect. They have assured us that they would obtain the views of the livestock exchange and other persons engaged in business on the stockyard before taking significant action affecting such persons.

In determining whether a stockyard owner acted reasonable, in a particular instance involving one or more commission firms, we believe that one of the relevant considerations would be whether the stockyard owner had obtained the views of the livestock exchange with respect to the matter at issue.

Sincerely yours,

RODNEY E. LEONARD,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] for their cooperation in clarifying the congressional intent in passing this bill.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE].

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and concur in the opening remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mr. Chairman, after extensive hearings, the House Committee on Agriculture approved H.R. 10673 which revises the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. The overwhelming support for this bill reflects, I believe, a strong consensus within the committee that this act should

be updated to make it clear that stockyard owners have the right and the responsibility to manage and regulate their own facilities in a reasonable and non-discriminatory manner.

In essence, the bill provides that no person may engage in business at a stockyard as a market agency or a dealer unless the stockyard owner has determined that such services will be beneficial to the business of the stockyard and its customers. Certainly it is not unreasonable to give the stockyard owner this measure of control over operations taking place on his own property.

The proposed legislation, at the same time, requires stockyard operators to maintain efficient, competitive markets and preserves the right of the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent abuses of authority by the stockyard owners. It provides that stockyard services shall not be refused on any basis that is unreasonable or discriminatory.

When the Packers and Stockyards Act was adopted in 1921, marketing conditions were in many respects much different from those prevailing today. The terminal markets held what amounted to a monopolistic position. The volume percentage of livestock moving through terminal markets has substantially declined. While the stockyard owner today still provides the facilities, the actual selling is done through commission firms and individuals. Owners have little power to determine who shall operate in their own yards. H.R. 10673 is designed to remedy this. I urge support for this bill.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, perhaps coming from New Jersey, I should not participate in this debate because probably I am not fully aware, even after a reading of the report, of the real purposes of this legislation or the implications therein. But as I read it, I have come to the conclusion that this legislation in effect is a private bill for the owners of stockyards whose business has been reduced perhaps 50 or 75 percent in the last several years due to changes in practices regarding the purchase and sale of livestock.

In reading the report, I also note that:

The Department of Agriculture presently contends that terminal stockyard owners have broad authority under existing law to manage and regulate their stockyard and the persons engaged in business thereon.

The views of the Department are set forth in the report. I have to believe therefore that this act will increase prices for the consumer. Under present law, as I read the report, there is nothing to prevent a stockyard owner from converting his operations or prohibiting anyone he wants from doing business with the yard on a reasonable basis. And this law will not change that. What the law will do, in my judgment at least, is to give the stockyard owners the right to demand that commission agents if they wish to face the realities deal exclusively with the stockyard owners.

In effect, this, in my judgment, will raise the price of meat to the consumer.

Another point interested me. That is the fact that one of the reasons alleged for this bill is that the shippers are not receiving as much money under the present system from the commission agents as they would if the cattle were sold at the stockyards. I would think that if the shippers were dissatisfied, we would be hearing from shippers.

Here is the key sentence as far as I am concerned. It appears on page 3 of the report. It states:

In addition, the testimony shows that some commission men do not properly represent the best interests of their shippers. They may have another occupation which takes most of their time, resulting in their failure to obtain the best price for their livestock shippers. This not only injures such shippers but may also serve to generally weaken prices at the market.

It seems to me that we are giving stockyard owners the right to say to commission agents, "Unless you deal exclusively with us, we will not handle your individual transactions."

This, in my judgment, could place such economic pressure on commission agents that they would be compelled and constrained to do just that. It seems to me—and I think we ought to understand it—that this legislation will increase the business of the stockyard owners. This seems to me to be the main purpose of the legislation. Today the stockyards can, by the exercise of any reasonable regulations that they wish, keep out any disreputable or unconscientious trader that they want so that I fail to see the real necessity for this legislation aside from the beneficial results to the stockyard owners.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas for some clarification.

Mr. PURCELL. The assumption that the gentleman just made about the owner of a stockyard being able to limit a commission agent to operating only in that yard is not a correct assumption.

In the Supreme Court decision commonly referred to as the Denver case, the Court held that a selling agent, a commission firm, could not be limited to one location. A commission firm, under that holding, may have commission business at various terminal markets.

Mr. CAHILL. I understand. May I ask the gentleman this question. In the gentleman's opinion, if this bill is enacted into law, will it increase the business of the stockyards?

Mr. PURCELL. Our hope is that it will, but it should not increase the price of cattle going through that stockyard.

Mr. CAHILL. Could this not prevent some independent commission merchants from making individual transactions with individual cattle raisers who would be in competition with the stockyard owners? And would this not involve possible additional costs?

Mr. PURCELL. The only manner in which an example such as the gentleman is referring to could occur would be as the gentlewoman from Washington

[Mrs. MAY] made very clear a few moments ago.

Let me clear up this point. The owners of the stockyards do not sell anything.

Mr. CAHILL. I realize that. They have facilities available for the commission agents.

Mr. PURCELL. That is correct.

If a commission agent is operating on a terminal stockyard and has violently opposed reasonable rules and is deliberately going to the terminal stockyard in question, and doing nothing but seeking business for himself away from the terminal stockyard, there could be times when the stockyard owner would have under this bill, the power to refuse to allow him to continue this practice, by denying the commission agent the right to sell at the stockyard.

Mr. CAHILL. Will the gentleman explain to me the statement on page 9 of the report, the last sentence, the third paragraph, which says:

Consequently, many stockyard owners fear to exercise authority which they probably now have.

Mr. PURCELL. Because the law is unclear. Courts have held that some actions of stockyard owners were prohibitive, resulting in civil liability. This effort is to clear the air and make specific what the stockyard owner's authority is.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman on the floor when I made my statement?

Mr. CAHILL. No. I regret that I was not.

Mrs. MAY. In this statement I tried to point out very clearly the benefit to the consumer of this legislation. In the first place, I was a member of the National Commission on Food Marketing, which was definitely consumer oriented. This was one of the very few completely unanimous recommendations that was made by the Commission. I will not read it again at this point—it is in my statement and the report. But the gentleman should notice that this change will protect the interests of both buyers and sellers. When there is an inefficiently operated terminal market—in other words, where an owner cannot refuse his services to people that are not working efficiently on his behalf and the producer's behalf—it is going to be a costly procedure for him. That makes it more expensive to handle livestock there. This, in turn is reflected in higher costs of livestock to buyers and eventually to consumers. Anytime any marketing process is unnecessarily costly and inefficient the consumer pays.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I must say to the Committee I have not been dissuaded from my original point of view upon examination of this report, that this legislation, it seems to me, must increase the business of the stockyard owners by giving them authority to deprive many individual entrepreneurs of the use of stockyards and, second, therefore, it must follow that prices will probably be increased to the ultimate consumer.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Will the gentleman note that we have kept every original protection in here, that was already in the Packers and Stockyards Act, against injurious discrimination.

Mr. CAHILL. That is why I do not understand the purpose of this bill.

Mrs. MAY. But present law does not make it clear that owner selectivity is not unfair discrimination. On this point I refer you to the Denver Stockyard case. The Supreme Court decision in this case implied that Congress should enact some legislation to clarify this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 302(a) (7 U.S.C. 202(a)) is amended to read:

"(a) When used in this title the term 'stockyard' means any place, establishment, or facility commonly known as stockyards, conducted, operated, or managed for profit or nonprofit as a public market for livestock producers, feeders, and buyers, consisting of pens, or other inclosures, and their appurtenances, in which live cattle, sheep, swine, horses, mules, or goats are received, held, or kept for sale or shipment in commerce."

(b) Section 303 (7 U.S.C. 203) is amended to read:

"After the expiration of thirty days after the Secretary has given public notice that any stockyard is within the definition of section 302 by posting copies of such notice in the stockyard, no person shall carry on the business of a market agency or dealer at such stockyard unless (1) the stockyard owner has determined that his services will be beneficial to the business and welfare of said stockyard, its patrons, and customers, which determination shall be made on a basis which is not unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory, and has given written authorization to such person, and (2) he has registered with the Secretary, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, his name and address, the character of business in which he is engaged, and the kinds of stockyards services, if any, which he furnishes at such stockyard. Every other person operating as a market agency or dealer as defined in section 301 of the Act may be required to register in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe. Whoever violates the provisions of this section shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$500 for each such offense and not more than \$25 for each day it continues, which shall accrue to the United States and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States."

(c) Section 304 (7 U.S.C. 205) is amended to read:

"All stockyard services furnished pursuant to reasonable request made to a stockyard owner or market agency at such stockyard shall be reasonable and nondiscriminatory and stockyard services which are furnished shall not be refused on any basis that is unreasonable or unjustly discriminatory: *Provided*, That in any State where the weighing

of livestock at a stockyard is conducted by a duly authorized department or agency of the State, the Secretary, upon application of such department or agency, may register it as a market agency for the weighing of livestock received in such stockyard, and upon such registration such department or agency and the members thereof shall be amenable to all the requirements of this Act, and upon failure of such department or agency or the members thereof to comply with the orders of the Secretary under this Act he is authorized to revoke the registration of such department or agency and to enforce such revocation as provided in section 315 of this Act."

(d) Section 307 (7 U.S.C. 208) is amended to redesignate the first sentence as paragraph "(a)" and to add a new paragraph (b) as follows:

"(b) It shall be the responsibility and right of every stockyard owner to manage and regulate his stockyard in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner, to prescribe rules and regulations and to require those persons engaging in or attempting to engage in the purchase, sale, or solicitation of livestock at such stockyard to conduct their operations in a manner which will foster, preserve, or insure an efficient, competitive public market."

(e) Section 312(a) (7 U.S.C. 213(a)) is amended by inserting after the words "in connection with" the phrase "determining whether persons should be authorized to operate at the stockyards, or with".

Mr. PURCELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PURCELL

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PURCELL: On page 1, line 3 after the word "Act" strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the typographical symbol ",".

On page 2, line 5, insert "Sec. 303." before the words "After the".

On page 3, line 4, insert "Sec. 304." before the words "All stockyard".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10673) to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 921, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amend was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 6, not voting 192, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

YEAS—234

Adair	Gathings	Mosher
Andrews	Glaimo	Murphy, Ill.
N. Dak.	Gibbons	Myers
Ashbrook	Gonzalez	Natcher
Ashmore	Goodling	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Baring	Gross	O'Neal, Ga.
Bates	Grover	O'Neill, Mass.
Battin	Gubser	Passman
Bell	Gude	Patman
Bennett	Haley	Patten
Berry	Hamilton	Pelly
Betts	Hanley	Pepper
Blackburn	Hansen, Idaho	Perkins
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Pettis
Boland	Hardy	Philbin
Bolling	Harsha	Pickle
Bolton	Hawkins	Pirnie
Bow	Hays	Poage
Brasco	Hébert	Pollock
Bray	Hechler, W. Va.	Pool
Brinkley	Hicks	Price, Ill.
Brooks	Hollfield	Pryor
Broomfield	Horton	Purcell
Brotzman	Howard	Quile
Brown, Calif.	Hull	Railsback
Brown, Mich.	Hungate	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Hunt	Reid, Ill.
Broyhill, Va.	Hutchinson	Reid, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Irwin	Reinecke
Burleson	Jarman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burton, Calif.	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Burton, Utah	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Pa.	Robison
Cabell	Jones, Mo.	Rodino
Carter	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Cederberg	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Clawson, Del.	Kleppe	Roth
Cohelan	Kyros	Roybal
Conable	Laird	Rumsfeld
Conte	Langen	Ruppe
Conyers	Latta	Ryan
Corbett	Leggett	Satterfield
Cramer	Lipscomb	St. Onge
Culver	Lloyd	Saylor
Daddario	Long, La.	Scheuer
Daniels	Long, Md.	Schneebell
Davis, Ga.	Lukens	Schweiker
Dellenback	McClary	Schwengel
Dickinson	McClure	Scott
Dingell	McDade	Shipley
Dole	McDonald,	Sisk
Donohue	Mich.	Skubitz
Dorn	McEwen	Smith, N.Y.
Dow	McFall	Smith, Okla.
Dowdy	McMillan	Snyder
Downing	MacGregor	Springer
Duncan	Machen	Stanton
Dwyer	Mahon	Steiger, Wis.
Edmondson	Marsh	Stephens
Edwards, Calif.	Martin	Stuckey
Erlenborn	Mathias, Calif.	Talcott
Esch	Matsunaga	Teague, Calif.
Evans, Colo.	May	Teague, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	Meeds	Tenzer
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Ga.
Findley	Miller, Ohio	Tuck
Fisher	Mills	Tunney
Flood	Minish	Udall
Foley	Monagan	Ullman
Ford, Gerald R.	Moore	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Morris, N. Mex.	Vander Jagt
Friedel	Morton	Vanik

Vigorito White
Waldie Whitener
Walker Wilson,
Watts Charles H.

NAYS—6

Cahill Cunningham
Carey Denney Fulton, Pa.
Mayne

NOT VOTING—192

Abbitt Gallagher
Abernethy Gardner
Adams Garmatz
Addabbo Gettys
Albert Gilbert
Anderson, Ill. Goodell
Anderson, Tenn. Gray
Andrews, Ala. Green, Pa.
Annunzio Griffiths
Arends Gurney
Ashley Hagan
Aspinall Hall
Barrett Halleck
Belcher Halpern
Bevill Hammer-
Biestler schmidt
Bingham Hanna
Blanton Harrison
Blatnik Harvey
Brademas Hathaway
Brock Heckler, Mass.
Brown, Ohio Helstoski
Buchanan Henderson
Burke, Fla. Herlong
Bush Holland
Buttton Hosmer
Byrnes, Wis. Ichord
Casey Jacobs
Celler Jonas
Clancy Jones, Ala.
Clausen Jones, N.C.
Don H. Karth
Cleveland Kazen
Collier Keith
Colmer Kelly
Corman King, N.Y.
Cowger Kirwan
Curtis Kluczyński
Davis, Wis. Kornegay
Dawson Kupferman
de la Garza Kuykendall
Delaney Kyl
Dent Landrum
Derwinski Lennor
Devine McCarthy
Diggs McCulloch
Dulski Macdonald,
Eckhardt Mass.
Edwards, Ala. Madden
Edwards, La. Mailliard
Ellberg Mathias, Md.
Eshleman Meskill
Everett Michel
Fallon Mink
Farbstein Minshall
Feighan Mize
Fino Montgomery
Flynt Moorhead
Ford Morgan
William D. Morse, Mass.
Fountain Moss
Frelinghuysen Multer
Fulton, Tenn. Murphy, N.Y.
Fuqua Nedzi
Galifanakis Nelsen
Nichols Zwach

Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Scherle with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Galifanakis with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Poff.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Cleveland.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Waggoner with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Minshall.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Hall.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Wamp-
ler.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Staf-
ford.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Taft.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Button.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr.
Williams of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Price of
Texas.

Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Kluczyński with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Steed.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Dawson.
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Gray.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Pucinski.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Yates.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. de la
Garza.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Hathaway.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Roush with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. CONTE changed his vote from
"nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read:

"To amend title III of the Packers and
Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the
table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that all Members
may have 5 legislative days in which to
extend their remarks on the bill just
passed, H.R. 10673, and include extra-
neous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gentle-
man from Texas?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE CONGO

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker,
I ask unanimous consent to address the
House for 1 minute and to revise and
extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gentleman
from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker,
the recent appearance before the African
Subcommittee of the Committee on For-
eign Affairs by Robert O. Blake, just re-
turned from his post as counselor and
chargé d'affaires from November 1966
to July 1967 at our Embassy in Kinshasa,
prompts me to make some remarks about
the Congo based on the intelligent ob-
servations of an experienced foreign serv-
ice officer.

Last spring we had many reasons to
be optimistic about the immediate future
of the Congo. It had had its difficult and
tragic moments but seemed to be on the
path to economic and political stability.
Hard work by the Congolese, by their
Western friends, and, in no small
measure, by the United States has paid
off. The Congolese educational system
expanded remarkably and a new genera-
tion of educated Congolese was moving
into positions of responsibility. Thanks
to its subsoil wealth, the Congo was ex-
panding its mineral production. Assisted
by the International Monetary Fund, the
Congo revalued its currency and estab-
lished a sound stabilization program
which promised to stimulate further its
economic development, especially in the
agricultural field. The United States was
playing an important role. It had ex-
tended about \$45 million in aid. Much of
this, in the form of Public Law 480 food-
stuffs, has generated counterpart funds
for the construction of roads, bridges, and
schools.

Unfortunately, on July 5 of this year a
small group of European mercenaries
mutinied. These mercenaries are still in
Bukavu in the eastern Congo. Their re-
volt threatened the stability and prog-
ress of the Congo. It also menaced the
important and fruitful relationship be-
tween the Congolese people and the for-
eign community. Most recently the Or-
ganization of African Unity met in Kin-
shasa, the Congo's capital, and adopted
a resolution calling for the immediate
departure of these mercenaries with the
help of competent international bodies.
It is my sincere hope that this effort

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following
pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Mathias of Mary-
land.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Biester.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Bush.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Rousebush.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Wyllie.
Mr. Lennor with Mrs. Heckler of Mas-
sachusetts.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr.
Zwach.

will succeed. Thereafter, we can expect a rededication of the Congolese Government and its peoples to the essential tasks of nation building and economic development. In these efforts, I am sure, the American Government will continue to help, thus carrying out its policy of consistent support for the central government of the Congo.

Mr. Speaker, I placed such importance on the recent summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity that I caused to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1967, on pages 26999 and 27000 the full text of the resolutions adopted, including that relating to the mercenaries.

DAVID T. PETERSON—FLIGHT TO VIETNAM

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleagues might find it heartwarming, as I did, to know of a letter written by one of my young constituents to a member of his church describing his feelings during his flight to Vietnam this summer.

David T. Peterson, from Decatur, Ga., is a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army Intelligence Division. The son of missionary parents and himself born in São Paulo, Brazil, David put himself through Georgia State College, where he received a BA degree in English and drama. An aspiring actor, David performed at the Oakhurst Baptist Church, at Georgia State College, and the Pocket Theater in Atlanta before he joined the service.

The letter which David wrote to a friend, Billy Densmore, music director at Oakhurst Baptist Church, sets forth his impressions and thoughts during his 20-hour flight from San Francisco to Vietnam. Because of my own recent trip to Vietnam, and because I feel an even greater appreciation of our fighting men there, I bring to your attention, with deep gratitude for the thoughts expressed, what I like to think may be a typically American letter, complete with comments on the personalities of the stewardesses on the airplane.

The letter of David Peterson, as reprinted in the Decatur-DeKalb News, follows:

It was 0600 on the morning of August 13, and our Braniff 707 was circling in a zig-zag pattern over Bien Hoa Air Base, which is just 20 miles north of Saigon. We were in a group of more than 100 officers on our first tour of duty in Vietnam.

As we approached Bien Hoa it was dark, all the lights in the big jet were out, cigarettes were extinguished and seat belts were fastened. As I looked out my window, I carefully scanned the darkness and noticed the lights blinking faintly in the distance. I was lucky to have a seat by the window, because everyone aboard was anxious to get a first glimpse of Vietnam.

The trip, which had lasted about 20 hours, included stops in Hawaii, Guam and the

Philippines. Throughout the flight, there was an air of joviality. David Sharp, sitting next to me, asked Dixie, the nice little red-headed stewardess, if red heads were more fun. Marni, another stewardess who had made her debut at 18 years old, spoke excellent Brazilian Portuguese, so, of course, I got her address.

But now, we were landing in Vietnam, and everyone was silent. Were we a little bit scared? Yes, I guess we were. We were wondering where we would go from here and what we would be doing. Would we go 20 miles away to Saigon to enjoy its music and gaiety for a few days? No, probably not. We would probably join our units which were scattered throughout South Vietnam from Con Tho to the northern limit, the DMZ.

The big jet landed gracefully and came to a halt. We waited a few minutes for the health inspector to come aboard. In silence we stood and looked in each other's faces and then off in the distance. I looked out the window and noticed that the sun had risen, over in the east, in the east from where we had flown, from that grand city, San Francisco.

Dixie and all the girls said goodbye to us as we stepped off the plane, down the stairway, and onto Vietnamese soil. The air had a clean scent and the sunrise was beautiful and full of color. I was aware of the noise and the power of the big Skyraider jets as they rose rapidly and fearlessly into the skies, but I was in awe of the silence and beauty of this hour. My eyes drifted to the multitudes of men who ahead of me and behind me were walking away from our plane towards the massive bungalow-style terminal building.

We were all apprehensive and every heart beat a little faster. Was it fear? No, I don't think so. It was a feeling which was hard to explain. I guess it was pride. I was proud to be here and proud of my fellow officers. I glanced back at the big jet we had just departed.

I took in the deep blue of the plane's fuselage and its towering size. The largeness seemed to represent the great country we had watched disappear in the distance 20 hours before. But my gaze stopped as I saw our American flag imprinted on the side of the airliner. A tear rolled down my cheek.

I'm proud of that flag and I'm proud of our commitment in Vietnam.

POLITICS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF OUR POSTAL SYSTEM

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about politics in the management of our postal system. I am shocked over a clear case of both politics and mismanagement this last week regarding the proposed merger of rural routes in Putnam County, Ind.

On September 13, I began receiving telephone calls and letters from the patrons of the Roachdale, Ind., post office stating their objections to a Post Office Department decision to consolidate rural delivery service involving four routes at Roachdale, Bainbridge, and Russellville.

Subsequently, I received a petition signed by 439 patrons which, along with my request, was forwarded to the Post Office Department.

On September 21, 1967, I received a

two-page letter signed by Mr. Howard R. Barker, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, which I make a part of this RECORD. Mr. Barker expressed regret that the Post Office Department was unable to approve my request.

The letter, in detail, explains that a savings of \$4,343 annually would result from the consolidation. The letter further states, and I quote:

The Department would be derelict in its duties to continue four such routes when good delivery service could continue to be provided by three carriers none of which would be employed as much as 40 hours per week.

Upon receipt of this notice I notified, by letter, the people of Roachdale of the Department's decision against a review of the case. Yesterday, September 28, 1967, I read in the Daily Banner, a Greencastle, Ind., publication, dated Monday, September 25, 1967, that the senior Senator from Indiana, who just happens to be a Democrat, had the pleasure of notifying the people of Roachdale he had been successful in retaining their mail service.

A call to the Post Office Department yesterday confirmed that the Senator's report was accurate.

I want to emphasize I am happy for the fine folks of Roachdale who will keep their rural routes as they wanted. However, I regret, by the Post Office Department's own admission, that we have a "derelict" Post Office Department.

Webster's dictionary defines derelict as "neglectful of obligation, unfaithful, careless, deserted, and abandoned."

Is it not a shame that the people of this country may soon be asked to pay much more in the form of increased postal rates to finance a careless, neglectful, and abandoned postal system?

A Republican Representative has been told "No" while simultaneously a Democrat is told "Yes." The fine, dedicated carriers and employees of the postal system deserve better and the tax-burdened public is entitled to better than such politically oriented decisions.

This is a clear case of politics being played by the Post Office Department. I would like to see some integrity and honesty someplace in the executive branch of this expensive Federal Government.

As long as the Post Office Department places such a high premium on political decisions we will continue to have a second-class postal system.

I include at this point the material I have previously referred to:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF OPERATIONS, Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967.

Hon. JOHN T. MYERS, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your letters of September 14, 1967, and September 18, 1967, transmitting a petition signed by Mr. Kenneth A. Miller, and others, patrons at Roachdale, Indiana, protesting the proposed consolidation of the rural delivery service at Roachdale, Bainbridge and Russellville, Indiana, incident to a vacancy at Greencastle.

When a rural vacancy occurs, it is the practice of the Department to have a survey made

to determine the feasibility of consolidating existing service prior to taking any action toward filling the position on a permanent basis. Such a survey was made in this instance.

The survey disclosed that it would be very practicable to consolidate Route No. 1 at Bainbridge, routes Nos. 1 and 2 at Roachdale and route No. 1 at Russellville into three routes so as to provide a surplus carrier at Roachdale for reassignment to fill the vacancy at Greencastle. There would be a saving of approximately \$4343 per annum in operating costs of the rural delivery service.

The four routes involved are not long and serve only 212, 199, 204 and 121 families. The present carrier schedules are evaluated at 31, 29½, 32 and 20 hours per week which is far below the normal workweek of 40 hours. All mail is delivered by 12:30 p.m.

The three consolidated routes would be 76, 71 and 74 pay miles in length and would serve 254, 269 and 213 families. The number of families to be served is well below the national average of 321 families. The proposed schedules would be evaluated at 38, 37 and 32½ hours per week and all mail would be delivered by 1:15 p.m.

The carriers would be routed over all weather roads and mail collected on the routes would be dispatched on the same day.

While it would be necessary for 156 families to change their mailing address, we consider this to be a temporary inconvenience only until such time as they can notify their correspondents of the new address.

The Department would be derelict in its duties to continue four such routes when good delivery service could continue to be provided by three carriers none of which would be employed as much as 40 hours per week.

Therefore, in view of the substantial savings involved, and the fact that excellent delivery service would be provided, the Department feels that it has no alternative, but to place the consolidation of service, as outlined above, into effect on October 1, 1967 as contemplated.

In view of your personal interest, it is regretted that we are unable to reply more favorably in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD R. BARKER,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General.

NO INTERRUPTION IN ROACHDALE SERVICE

U.S. Senator Vance Hartke, a member of the Senate Post Office Committee, announced today in Washington that there will be no interruption in the present Roachdale Post Office rural route service.

The Post Office Department had recommended earlier the Roachdale routes be consolidated with service from Bainbridge and Russellville.

Petitions and letters substantiating Sen. Hartke's position had been received from some 450 postal patrons at Roachdale.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the chief sponsor of the House resolution calling on Congress to undertake a fundamental view of Vietnam policies, I was gratified to see the following editorial comment which appeared in the September 27 San Francisco Chronicle:

CONGRESSMEN ASK LOOK AT VIETNAM

The move by an unusual coalition of 52 Congressmen to re-examine deepening American involvement in Vietnam is heartening to anyone who believes in constitutional government. The coalition includes both Republicans and Democrats, hawks and doves.

Representative Paul Findley (Rep.-Ill.) is the spokesman for these 52 Representatives who are calling on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to pass formal judgment on whether the Administration is really authorized to do what it is doing in southeast Asia.

President Johnson has repeatedly cited the Gulf of Tonkin resolution as Congressional authority for committing Americans to combat in Vietnam. This resolution was passed three years ago. Requested by Johnson after a reported naval clash in the Gulf, it contained the stereotyped wording calling for "all necessary measures to prevent further aggression."

It was not, as Senator Clifford Case (Rep.-N.J.) expressed it so well this week, a continuing letter of credit to the President to draw on indefinitely. In fact, a parallel movement toward reassertion of Congressional prerogatives in foreign policy is under way in the Senate. There the Foreign Relations Committee is expected to approve a resolution limiting the authority of the executive branch to enter into military commitments without legislative approval.

Three years, as all Americans are aware, have brought drastic changes in the war in Vietnam and our commitment there. Congressman Findley senses "a great uneasiness" over this situation among members of Congress, including many who had voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

In his careful, restrained approach, Findley rightly points out that placing the Vietnam issue "squarely on the Congressional anvil" should ultimately have a unifying influence in clarifying America's will and purpose and "removing the feeling of uneasiness so prevalent today."

More evidence of general concern is shown by the dramatic change in the latest California Poll of persons representing all shades of political opinion and walks of life. Compared with a year ago, there has been a definite shift among both Democrats and Republicans against the Johnson Administration's policy of escalation and increased emphasis on military measures in Vietnam.

The stirring in Congress to tackle head on its constitutional responsibilities is a healthy development for the country.

POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the more than 50 Members of the House who this week cosponsored companion resolutions directing the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report on the desirability of further congressional action with respect to our policies in Southeast Asia, I should like to outline very briefly the reasons which led me to join in sponsoring the resolution and to suggest what I believe are some of the benefits which can be realized from approval of the resolution.

Never before in our history, to the best of my knowledge, has the United States

ever fought a major war in which congressional participation in the determination of policy has been so strictly limited. Aside from the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in August 1964—which did not even begin to contemplate the huge expansion of the war which followed—the role of the Congress has, for all practical purposes, been limited to the more or less routine approval of military authorizations and appropriations.

It is worth noting, too, that the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, which was passed without a dissenting vote in the House, was considered in the midst of a presidential campaign in which the principal issue was the President's strong opposition to a major expansion of the war.

To a considerable extent, therefore, neither the people nor their representatives in the Congress have been consulted about decisions which have involved the United States, step by step, in one of the costliest, most destructive and most dangerous wars in history. Whatever our individual views may be about this war and the administration's conduct of it, there is no reason to doubt that Congress has important constitutional, political and moral responsibilities concerning the Vietnam conflict. This is especially true in the absence of a formal declaration of war. Our resolution, Mr. Speaker, would provide a means for Congress to accept and carry out these responsibilities.

The lack of real deliberation with respect to our policy in Southeast Asia on the part of the Nation's chief deliberative body has contributed, I believe, to the restlessness, the questioning, the unease in the country which have been noted by several of our colleagues. Without the leadership of Congress, the national debate on this major aspect of our foreign policy has inevitably been inadequate. It has lacked direction and focus. Our people have been deprived of reliable information on which to form a meaningful public opinion about our national purpose and the means we are using to achieve it. And the administration has been deprived of the benefits of accountability, the searching scrutiny which would require it to do a better job of informing the people and justifying its policy.

In my own experience as a Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have found it impossible to justify to my constituents the failure of Congress to conduct a thorough debate on our Vietnam policy. In no other area of major national policy—foreign or domestic—have we failed to do this. In most areas, in fact, such debate or deliberation is carried on periodically as Congress considers legislation to establish, amend, or appropriate for such programs as foreign aid, the war on poverty, housing, urban development, agriculture, public works, and so forth. The war in Vietnam, inexplicably, is the only exception, and this is the single most crucial issue confronting the country.

Approval of our resolution will bring the issue of U.S. policy in Vietnam before the Congress for the very first time in all its fullness and complexity. It will provide the first real opportunity for Congress—the direct representatives of

the people—to consider all aspects of our policy in that beleaguered land, to determine whether and to what extent we approve of the policies being followed by the administration, and to recommend whatever changes, if any, we may want to urge upon the administration. I am sure I speak for all the cosponsors of our resolution when I say that we have no desire or intention to usurp or limit in any way the constitutional authority of the Chief Executive for the conduct of our foreign relations or the command of our Armed Forces. Our sole purpose is to assure the people, through their Congress, their right to participate in the determination of their own destiny.

If our resolution is approved, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we can anticipate many benefits, including the following:

First, the provision of more and better information about our Vietnam policies by the administration;

Second, greater understanding of the nature and extent and legal basis of our commitment in Vietnam;

Third, a more accurate estimate of our present military position and future prospects in Vietnam;

Fourth, greater awareness of the international political implications of our present course;

Fifth, the opportunity for congressional consideration of such critical and complex issues as the significance of the bombing of North Vietnam, the adequacy of U.S. efforts to bring the war to the negotiating table, and the character of the pacification program, together with consideration of the several important alternatives to present policies in each of these areas which have been proposed by a number of our colleagues and which have received less than forthright responses from the administration; and, finally,

Sixth, the opportunity for a formal expression of Congress views on the war in general and on the more significant specific issues raised by the war.

During the years of our involvement in the fighting in Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, our commitment has grown to the point where it now extends to nearly half a million young Americans and tens of billions of American dollars. Is it too much to ask, I wonder, for Congress to stop long enough to consider in depth what we are doing, and why, and where we are going? We owe it to our people and to our own self-respect as a great legislative institution.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS TO NEW CITY COUNCIL

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded and embarrassed by the President's appointment yesterday to the new City Council.

Can anyone in this body imagine a

draft dodger, a conscientious objector, being chairman of a city council or chairman of a board of supervisors in any other city or county of the United States during a war?

Can you imagine any other city or county tolerating a city councilman who was a rabblouser, a promoter of demonstrations who condones civil disobedience, during a time when our cities are trying so desperately to maintain and enhance respect for law and order?

Can you imagine the appointment of a Bobby Baker crony, a bank manipulator, a lobbyist, as the chairman of the city council of a city straining for a semblance of prestige and respectability?

Perhaps we should sympathize with the President. Admittedly, his choices were drastically limited. Washington may be a classic example of a fundamental failing of our cities. Long ago the competent and concerned citizens moved to the suburbs. They were no longer willing to carry the burden of city management and of citizen participation required to make a city pleasant and progressive for those who were unwilling to carry their share of the load. The incompetent and unconcerned have stayed behind. They cannot manage themselves, their homes, their streets, or neighborhoods. How could they manage their city? Into the inner core of the big cities have moved many people who have absolutely no experience, training, or ability in city management or city citizenship. Little wonder our cities have deteriorated.

Like other cities, too many people have moved to Washington for what they can get or take from the city—not what they can contribute. Until the citizens contribute more than they consume, their neighborhood and their city will deteriorate.

It is obvious now why the President had to go out of Washington to find a city manager and an assistant city manager. There was no one in Washington competent to fill the requirements.

We should study these appointments to the new City Council carefully. The obvious implications are a tragic commentary on the competency and level of citizenship of the Nation's Capital. If these nominees are the best Washington, D.C., can offer, the District is a long way from effective or competent home rule, and there are many problems ahead which cannot be solved by spending more and more Federal money and some serious ills that can be cured only by raising the competency level of the citizenry.

A FANTASTIC PLOT—PART II

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted into the RECORD reports from UPI and the Philadelphia Inquirer detailing the fantastic plot against various leading political figures in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia Inquirer of today

details the latest developments of members of the Chinese Communist oriented Revolutionary Action Movement who are behind it all. Today's revelations indicate intentions of murdering the President of the United States and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The extreme nature of RAM has been known for some time, but to help fill in the details of their tactics and goals, I insert into the RECORD excerpts of the Inquirer's article, "Death of President, Tate, Rizzo, Plotted by Ring, Convict Says," by George J. Murray and E. J. Hussie:

DEATH OF PRESIDENT, TATE, RIZZO PLOTTED BY RING, CONVICT SAYS HOOVER, SPECTER ALSO ON LIST

(By George J. Murray and E. J. Hussie)

A conspiracy to murder high Government and city officials and destroy with dynamite Federal and municipal buildings has been exposed by an escaped Georgia convict now being held for extradition, it was disclosed Thursday.

According to the informer, the assassination list included President Johnson, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Mayor James H. J. Tate, District Attorney Arlen Specter and Police Commissioner Frank L. Rizzo.

DYNAMITE CHARGE

Tate, according to the informer, was to be killed with dynamite charged to detonate when he started his car. Rizzo was to be shot by the informer himself, who boasted he asked only five days to "set Rizzo up."

There were indications late Thursday the informer would be arrested on charges of threatening to kill the officials named in the list he claimed was supplied by members of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), an anarchist, Black Power group sympathetically allied with Red China.

The man was identified as Herman Bailey, alias Robert Earl Bailey, 22, of Atlanta, who now is being held at Holmesburg Prison. Bailey was arrested last November and held for extradition proceedings to Georgia. He was transferred to Holmesburg last August as a troublemaker after attempting to start a riot in the House of Detention.

POLITICAL ISSUE

The plot disclosed by Bailey immediately was made a political issue by Tate who charged Specter—his opponent in November's mayoralty election—left the Mayor and his family defenseless by failing to warn him of the danger of assassination.

Specter replied that Rizzo was kept abreast of the investigation from the beginning as a result of a system of "instant coordination between the District Attorney's office, the Police Department and the FBI."

Bailey, who is being held without bail for Georgia authorities and faces a detainer filed by the U.S. District Court, where he recently was sentenced to nine months' imprisonment, said the RAM members promised to help obtain his freedom so that he could shoot Rizzo.

EXPERT RIFLE SHOT

Bailey claimed to be an expert shot with a rifle.

The alleged multiple assassination plot came to light just one day after another youth, who said he was a member of RAM, turned over a half-pound of potassium cyanide to the FBI and said it was intended for use to kill policemen and other citizens in the wake of an artificially instigated riot.

The FBI laboratory in Washington studied the cyanide and reported it in "pure" state. Experts said its quantity was sufficient to kill 1000 to 4500 persons.

The poison plot was exposed by Hilton Louis Jones, 22, of Wilt st. near 31st. He is

a neighbor of Maxwell Stanford, 33, of Fontaine st. near 31st and Diamond sts., who has been identified as national leader of RAM.

Last summer, Stanford and 15 New York RAM members were arrested on charge of plotting the murders of moderate Negro leaders Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and Whitney M. Young, executive director of the National Urban League.

It was not disclosed whether Bailey identified other members of the multiple assassination plot—which included plans to dynamite City Hall, the Police Administration Building at 8th and Race sts., and the Federal Courthouses at 9th and Market sts.

NAMES THREE IN PLOT

However, Jones—who was reported as cooperating with the FBI for weeks during an investigation—identified three men by name and one by description as fellow conspirators.

One of those named, William James Lyles, 26, of Cumberland st. near Front, was found already in custody at the Philadelphia detention center.

Reginald Grantham, 21, was arrested in a house on Spring Garden st. near 36th on Thursday afternoon by members of the police civil disobedience unit, which received a tip he was hiding out there.

CHICAGO STUDENT

Grantham was taken immediately to the Administration Building, where he asked that he be interrogated without delay. He was joined there by his attorney, Arthur Early.

The third man named by Jones was picked up Wednesday night in Chicago near the University of Chicago campus, where he is enrolled as a political science graduate student.

He is Anthony B. Monteiro, 22, who said he was a graduate of Lincoln University. The fourth man, identified only as Sakeeb, still is being sought.

WAIVES EXTRADITION

Monteiro was arraigned before a Chicago magistrate early Thursday and refused to waive extradition. However, later, he appeared in Cook County Court accompanied by two lawyers and waived extradition before Judge Joseph A. Power.

Monteiro denied in Chicago he was connected with any Black Power groups and stated he would "get all this straightened out" upon his return to Philadelphia.

He was hurried to an airliner and was due to arrive at International Airport here at 11:36 p.m. Thursday.

Specter said Lyles, Grantham and Monteiro would be arraigned Friday morning in City Hall before Judge Leo Weinrott.

TRAINING CAMP

Bailey said he was told that RAM operated a large "training headquarters" somewhere in Virginia and that he would be taken there after he assassinated Rizzo.

Bailey and Jones reportedly both submitted voluntarily to lie-detector tests, which indicated they were telling the truth.

The investigation of the Bailey revelations dates back a month or more—one would say exactly how far. It was so secret that Edward J. Hendrick, superintendent of Philadelphia prisons, was unaware it was going on.

Hendrick told The Inquirer on Thursday he was so irked over repeated delays in Bailey's extradition proceedings he prodded the District Attorney's office "to move this thing."

"He was being taken downtown to court once every three weeks," Hendrick said. "Each time he would be returned to prison with a card marked 'case continued.' He was down there (City Hall) last Tuesday."

It was learned that on Tuesday, Bailey's statement was prepared formally, signed and sworn to.

Hendrick said Bailey was one of the "ring-leaders" in the Detention Center whenever there was trouble.

TROUBLEMAKER

"A number of our ring-leaders are coming up in other things," he said. "We feel good we were able to spot them."

He said Lyles was spotted as a troublemaker when he arrived at the Detention Center last August on charges of inciting to riot.

"We put him straight into the House of Correction to keep him separated from the others," Hendrick said.

PLANNING ORDERLY RURAL DEVELOPMENT CAN CHECK THE OVERCROWDING OF URBAN CENTERS

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the problems of our overcrowded cities have erupted into violence in so many areas this summer that we must take action on many different fronts. The possibility of intelligently planning the orderly development of rural areas has not been examined as thoroughly as I believe it should be.

Some cogent analysis of these problems and their solution is contained in a series of editorials in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser, September 25 to 28, which follows:

DIFFICULTIES OF BIG CITIES TIED TO ILLS OF SMALL TOWNS

The baffling problems of the big cities, particularly those of the ghettos, have resulted to a considerable extent from the troubles of the rest of the country.

The drift of people from rural areas and small communities to the cities has been under way for many years. In the last decade it has been greatly increased by three factors:

1. The inability of many tenant farmers and owners of small farms to make a decent living.
2. The elimination of jobs, particularly in coal mines, by the use of machinery.
3. The determination of more and more Negroes to gain their civil rights and better opportunities for themselves and their children.

Surveys have shown that the movement to the cities is beginning to slow down. But federal officials have reported that the number of migrants still reaches about 600,000 a year.

Los Angeles Mayor Sam Yorty said recently that about 1,000 newcomers arrive there each week. He estimated that at least a fourth of them come from the South.

Most of the migrants lack skills for any job that pays well. These usually drift into the ghettos and increase the crowding in the woefully substandard housing there.

Thousands that can't find work have to depend on welfare benefits. Some turn to crime.

But besides the disadvantaged newcomers who greatly complicate the problems of the big urban centers, many talented and educated young people who could benefit their smaller communities go to cities to take advantage of more promising opportunities for a career.

Men from Huntington have risen high in

law, medicine and business in New York and other large cities. Several have done well in art, science, engineering and the entertainment field.

The hospital and research facilities of the big cities offer strong attractions especially to young doctors of exceptional ability.

The major cause of the acute shortage of doctors in this state is the tendency of graduates of the West Virginia Medical Center to leave for practice elsewhere.

The acquisition of independent retail and wholesale businesses and industries by large corporations also has tended to drain competent and ambitious young people away from towns and small cities.

The most capable employees of the corporations move up to better jobs and generally reach a big city.

The affiliation of the Chesapeake & Ohio and the Baltimore & Ohio railroads has already resulted in the transfer of more employees from Huntington than will come here.

The loss of community leaders through such transfers and the removal of young people who would become leaders tend to reduce the launching of new enterprises that would create jobs.

There are opportunities here for the development of profitable aluminum fabrication industries such as those operating near the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. works at Spokane, Wash.

Before the Kaiser plant opened at Ravenswood, the company took a number of newsmen and Chamber of Commerce representatives to Spokane. Company spokesmen pointed out that operations similar to those in that area could be developed along the Ohio and Kanawha Valleys for fabricating aluminum from the Ravenswood plant.

The possibilities were discussed in West Virginia newspapers at the time. But fabricating industries have not developed as they might have if there had been more enterprising men in the area.

Similarly there are opportunities here for the opening of plants to fabricate nickel, steel and plastics produced in and near Huntington. But there are few such operations even though the city is prospering from the payrolls of its big industries and from heavy shipments of coal.

The constant draining of people away from rural and small urban areas to the overcrowded cities is comparable to giving an overweight patient with high blood pressure one transfusion after another from an underweight victim of anemia.

The big patient has already suffered attacks similar to apopleptic strokes in the form of destructive riots. His well-being is further endangered by polluted air and water, increasing crime and the nerve strain of crowding, commuting and competing for advancement.

The rising costs of government and the increasing welfare load comparable to medical bills are forcing the patient to call for more and more aid.

The anemic patient, who represents the rural urban areas, lacks the means to provide the remedies for the symptoms or the basic causes of his trouble.

Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnitzler said in an address at Columbus, Ohio, some time ago:

"Rural towns that once flourished with manufacturing or as railroad centers are now stagnant or deteriorating aggregations of grocery stores, taverns, feed stores, filling stations, garages and empty buildings. They have lost their place in our modern economy."

For several years The Advertiser has been urging legislation to deal with the twin problems of the deterioration of towns and the festering of overcrowded cities.

Now riots and other troubles of the cities have forced themselves upon the attention of high federal officials. At the same time

members of Congress and some members of the President's Cabinet have taken up the problems of rural America.

Remedies proposed to adjust the imbalance in which 70 per cent of the people live on one per cent of the land will be discussed in other editorials of this series.

EFFORTS UNDER WAY TO SLOW DRIFT OF PEOPLE TO CITIES

Several federal programs have been launched to help relieve poverty, create jobs, provide training for them, improve living conditions and in general offer a better life for both city and rural dwellers.

Such efforts should be continued, and some of them should be expanded to meet the needs of millions of disadvantaged people.

But while these remedies relieve some of the troubles, they do not sufficiently reduce the migration of people from the stagnant rural areas to the already crowded big cities. For that a more extensive effort is necessary.

The continuing flow of people from farms and rural towns to the congested big urban areas has been called by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman one of the most serious problems of our times.

For a penetrating study of possible solutions he has announced the sponsorship of a symposium by himself and five other Cabinet members in Washington next December. Eminent economists, sociologists, city planners and population specialists will attend.

Meanwhile, other officials have proposed attacks on the problem.

West Virginia's Democratic Sens. Jennings Randolph and Robert C. Byrd have joined in cosponsoring a rural development bill presented by Republican Sen. James B. Pearson of Kansas.

The measure proposes these tax incentives for attracting job-producing industries and commercial establishments to rural areas:

1. A 14 per cent credit on machinery instead of the normal 7 per cent.

2. A 7 per cent investment credit on the cost of the building.

3. An accelerated depreciation of two-thirds on machinery, equipment and building.

4. A 25 per cent tax deduction above the normal 100 per cent for wages paid low-income persons.

Credits and deductions can be carried backward three years and forward 10 years.

A number of conditions are provided for the benefits. The firm must locate in a county that does not have a city of more than 50,000 population.

At least 15 per cent of the families of the county must have incomes of under \$3,000 a year, or employment must have declined at an annual rate of more than 5 per cent during the last five years.

Areas are included where the closing or curtailing of operations of a Defense Department installation is likely to cause a substantial removal of residents.

The secretary of agriculture may also certify the eligibility of Indian reservations after consulting with the secretary of the interior.

Another of the several additional requirements is that the employer must prove that he has not discontinued a similar enterprise and will not reduce the employment in any other area as a result of opening the new establishment.

Restrictions upon the areas in which the benefits would be effective would prevent the development of jobs that would attract many unemployed workers from the big cities.

But if it proved as effective as its sponsors hope, the measure would at least slow the removal of people from rural areas.

Possibly in time its provisions could be extended to encourage the opening of estab-

lishments offering work for which city dwellers could be trained and resettled.

Many depressed rural areas, such as those in much of Appalachia, however, are not suitable for extensive industrial development. The best hope of economic progress for the mountainous counties of eastern and southern West Virginia lies in the development of vacation and recreational facilities.

Dams, reservoirs, parks and forest reservations already existing or proposed in that region offer encouragement for building a great playground that would provide work for thousands.

Completion of the Interstate Highway system, Appalachian development roads and the Allegheny scenic highway proposed by Sen. Byrd would open those areas of rugged natural beauty for the enjoyment of millions from the steaming cities of the East and Middle West.

For full success of this development and others in the program of balanced economic growth of the nation, however, still faster transportation facilities will be necessary.

Business and industrial personnel will need jet plane service back and forth and rapid helicopter travel to and from regional airports. There will also be need for fast passenger trains that will carry automobiles.

The rural areas and small cities must have the means of providing theatres, libraries, playgrounds, better schools, regional colleges, swimming pools, golf courses, hospitals and other medical facilities.

There must be facilities to enable young people to develop their full potential for success and to enable them and their elders to travel quickly and frequently to the big cities for business or pleasure.

And these less populous areas must grant the full rights of citizenship and full opportunities for education, employment and advancement to all persons regardless of race or color.

The disadvantaged particularly should be urged to profit by their opportunities.

This should be done because it is right and just.

But besides that, encouraging the millions of low-income families throughout the country to qualify for a higher standard of living would bring a level of progress and prosperity never before approached.

The resultant wealth and harmony would give the nation a strength and respect in the world that it could never otherwise achieve.

STUDY PROPOSED AS BASIS FOR BALANCED U.S. GROWTH

A plan for an extensive study of means of achieving a better balance in the economic growth of the United States has been offered in a proposed joint resolution of Congress.

The measure was introduced in the Senate by Sen. Karl E. Mundt, R-S. D., for himself and 18 others, including Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va.

To carry out the study the resolution authorizes the President to appoint a commission of 20 members.

Four of the appointees would come from United States cities having a population of at least a million. Four would be from cities of between a million and 100 thousand population, four from those of between 100 and 10 thousand, and four from communities of less than 10 thousand.

The final four would be appointed for special qualifications to help carry out the work of the commission without regard to place of residence or political affiliation.

Not more than half of those chosen from cities or towns could be from the same political party.

The commission would make an analysis and evaluation of:

1. The social, political and economic factors that affect the geographical location of industry;

2. The social, political and economic factors

necessary to enable industries to operate efficiently outside large urban centers or to operate and expand within large urban centers without the creation of new economic and social problems;

3. The limits imposed upon population density to enable municipalities or other political subdivisions to provide public services in the most efficient and effective manner;

4. The effect on government efficiency generally of differing patterns and intensities of population concentration;

5. The extent to which a better geographic balance in the economic development of the nation serves the public interest;

6. The role that state and local government can and should play in promoting geographic balance in the economic development of a state or region; and

7. Practical ways in which federal expenditures can and should be managed to encourage a greater geographic balance in the economic development of the nation.

The study would also cover various ways by which the federal government might effectively encourage a more balanced economic growth.

The resolution requires that the study be completed and a report of findings and recommendations be submitted to the President and to Congress within two years after its effective date.

The commission and its authorized subcommittees and members are empowered to hold hearings. Departments and agencies of the executive branch of the government are directed to furnish any information the commission requests to help in carrying out its work.

The study would not be limited to the subjects specifically assigned. Experience gained as the work progressed would doubtless open new avenues of investigation.

The major purpose of the resolution seems to be to open the way for planning national economic growth to obtain a better balance.

The imbalance now existing between the troubled, overcrowded cities and the deteriorating rural areas gives abundant evidence of the need of such a program.

The possible benefits of national planning have been demonstrated also by the improvements brought about by city and area planning.

If a planning program had been in effect for the nation a generation ago, it could have prevented or alleviated many of the social and economic ills that challenge city, state and federal governments today.

But besides providing the basis for a planning program, the study can encourage general economic development by:

1. Stimulating community agencies to greater effort in attracting business and industry to rural towns and areas.

2. Encouraging smaller cities to join in regional development programs, as The Advertiser has been urging the Huntington and Charleston areas to do in providing a new airport midway between them.

3. Pointing out to progressive companies opportunities for locating branch operations in certain areas and supplying ideas for expanding various lines of production.

The commission might perform a distinct service by studying the benefits of locating railway operating offices at the most advantageous points along their lines.

This Tri-State Area is near the center of the origin of much of the coal hauled by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. It would thus seem to be a superior location for many of the company's offices.

Bringing more people here and providing faster service would tend to attract diversified industries to the area already highly favored by an abundance of fresh water and other resources such as coal, salt brines and natural gas.

Merger of the Norfolk & Western with the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio affilia-

tion could open the way for the development of a great railway center here that would provide the stimulus for the growth of a much bigger metropolitan area.

Through such benefits of planned and speeded economic growth the sponsors of the resolution and the commission it established could become the architects for rebuilding the nation into a balanced new pattern that would assure all its people a fairer share of its great riches, and would stand as a shining example of justice and wise management throughout the world.

NATIONAL PLANNING NEEDED TO BALANCE FUTURE GROWTH

The federal government itself could set an example to private business and industry for bringing about a better balance in the nation's economic and population growth.

For several years The Advertiser has been advocating the creation of a national planning agency to make studies and recommendations for the location of new federal bases and installations and for the award of new space and defense contracts.

A short time ago the Republican party's National Coordinating Committee proposed in a five-point program that more government contracts and installations go to poor rural areas.

The five points were outlined in a New York Times News Service story to The Advertiser as follows:

1. Economic incentives for factories to locate in poor rural areas; channeling more government defense and supply contracts and building more installations in such areas.
2. Increased aid for schools, including more vocational-technical schools, in rural areas.
3. Enactment of the rural community action section of the opportunity crusade, the Republican alternative to the administration's antipoverty program.
4. Providing rural areas with the kind of employment service available to urban workers.
5. Stepping up the work of the economic development administration in poor rural areas to attract new industries.

Not only slowing but eventually reversing the migration from rural areas to big cities, as previous editorials in this series have pointed out, is necessary as an attack upon growing social and economic ills.

The need will become even more urgent as the population of the big cities increases. In recent years about four-fifths of the rapid population growth has been in the already congested cities, and much of that has been in the crowded, impoverished slums.

How this crowding can increase, with consequent complication of problems, is illustrated by predictions of future population gains.

The number of people in the nation reached 100,000,000 between the census of 1910 and that of 1920. The total in 1920 was 105,710,620. Within a few weeks the population is expected to reach 200,000,000.

The increase from 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 will thus require about 50 years. But forecasters say only about 30 years will be necessary to reach 300,000,000.

If the proportionate rate of growth in the big cities continues as it has in the last few years, the problem of financing an adequate war on poverty, pollution and congestion could become too great for solution.

But as great as this problem would be, the danger of cataclysmic destruction from a possible nuclear attack upon the major cities would be much more awesome.

These populous centers would be the first targets of enemy missiles. The fact that some of them are on the coasts would make them still easier to hit with missiles from submarines.

And the location of many of our defense facilities and essential production industries

on the coasts would simplify the work of an enemy in destroying them.

The need of dispersing essential defense industries and installations was widely discussed during the destructive bombing of World War II.

Some European countries, notably Sweden, have built extensive underground facilities. We have concentrated even our defense research facilities on the coasts, the most vulnerable areas.

Locating new federal installations on the recommendations of a national planning agency could definitely strengthen national security.

In most cases it would probably also give the installations other advantages not available at spots chosen by congressional committee chairman influenced by their constituents.

The threatened serious national water problem is another vital reason for efforts to reverse the migration to the big cities. The seriousness of this threat has been demonstrated by the water shortage that existed in New York and other cities of the Northeast.

Conditions during the long drought there gave ominous emphasis to the 1966 report of a Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution headed by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine.

One paragraph of the report said:

"Our withdrawal of water was 40 billion gallons per day in 1900. It will reach 450 billion gallons in 1970 and 650 billion gallons per day in 1980. The current estimate of usable fresh water in lakes, streams, and reservoirs is 650 billion gallons a day. We will soon reach the limit of our water supply, and because water demands will continue to rise in accordance with population increases and per capita use, it is clear that water needs can be met only by an immediate large-scale expansion of our water resources development program and by continued reuse of the available water supply. Unless pollution is controlled, water cannot be reused."

Dispersing the population to make better use of the available supply of water is important not only because of the growing household consumption but because of the great quantities essential for some industries.

Once the federal government demonstrated the importance of dispersing its bases and installations, private business and industry would doubtless be inclined to follow its example, particularly if tax incentives were offered.

A policy of channeling government contracts into rural areas would also influence industries to locate there.

The factors cited in this series of editorials definitely seem to justify congressional approval of:

1. A bill providing tax incentives for the location of business and industry in rural areas;
2. A resolution for studies to provide the base for a better balance in economic growth;
3. A measure creating a national planning agency to make studies and recommendations for the location of government installations and contracts.

The serious conditions discussed call for prompt efforts to generate popular enthusiasm for planned progress that can bring such enormous benefits.

Serious troubles within the cities have already demonstrated that it may be much later than we think.

Allowing the influx of people from rural areas and towns to continue while middle-class residents leave the core of cities for the suburbs could make the problems impossible of solution.

That could bring on a hopeless era of violence and destruction even if fortune spared the jam-packed millions cremation in the flames of nuclear war.

ACTION COULD HAVE BEEN TAKEN ON A CONTINUING RESOLUTION ON APPROPRIATIONS TODAY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to observe that the House has been in session today. It has passed legislation.

I further observe that if the Rules Committee had met yesterday on the continuing resolution, it could have been brought up today and action taken on it.

MENTAL RETARDATION

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, many Americans today are concerned about the population explosion and about the problems of mentally retarded people. What many of us who share these concerns do not know is the close relationship there is between them.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Katherine Oettinger, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Family Planning and Population, made a timely speech last week at the dedication of the Child Development Center at Howard University.

The Child Development Center is one of about 140 mental retardation clinics now being supported in whole or in part by the Children's Bureau. These centers provide training and care for the mentally retarded where it is most needed—at the local level. As Mrs. Oettinger said of the Center at Howard University:

Your Child Development Center . . . will be able to bring to . . . many families . . . the most recent advances in the field of mental retardation. And your work is of even greater significance because your facilities are right at the doorstep of the homes of so many people who otherwise might find no relief from their fears and their burdens.

Last week the House unanimously passed the Mental Retardation Amendments of 1967, a key element in President Johnson's recommendations to aid the welfare of our children. Its passage insures that many more of the 6 million mentally retarded Americans will receive proper care and training by making available funds to assist in the construction and staffing of mental retardation centers. This is indeed heartening.

But the pessimism expressed by several Members of this House during the debate on the bill as to the likelihood of any immediate or substantial reduction in the number of children born with this affliction was disheartening. This pessimism stands in contrast to the optimism expressed by Mrs. Oettinger that we can do something to reduce these rolls and we can do it now.

Two of the major ways in which we can reduce the incidence of mental retardation with the knowledge we now have is through better maternal and child care and by making family planning services more readily available to all mothers. As Mrs. Oettinger pointed out, premature births occur most frequently among four groups of women: teenage mothers—particularly among unwed teenage mothers—mothers over 40, mothers who have already borne three babies, and mothers who have children one right after the other with no adequate spacing between them.

Mrs. Oettinger offered some striking figures. She said:

The baby who comes into life prematurely is 20 times as vulnerable to mental retardation . . . as the full-term infant—Everytime a woman delays pregnancy until she is in the optimum condition for both child bearing and child rearing, she increases the chance of her future children to live a life free from such handicapping defects as mental retardation.

Other presently possible means of lowering the incidence of mental retardation are through universal vaccination against measles, through the screening of all newborn infants for phenylketonuria, commonly known as PKU, and through widespread efforts to remove all lead paints from the interiors of old homes and to educate people as to the dangers inherent in lead poisoning. Programs to counter these possible causes of mental retardation are underway. The Public Health Service spearheaded the campaign to educate the public as to the dangers of measles and cooperates with State and local agencies to make measles vaccine readily available at a minimum cost to all children. By late 1966, 34 States had enacted laws pertaining to the screening of newborn infants for PKU. And the Children's Bureau will shortly issue a publication entitled, "Lead Poisoning in Children" in an effort to educate more physicians and parents to this syndrome. The Bureau is also working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development to chart a program whereby local public health authorities will make available to landlords, on a low-cost basis, the machinery needed to remove lead paint from the inside walls of dwellings.

Thus we can and are doing something for both sides of the coin of mental retardation. While we cannot eradicate it with the knowledge we now have, we can lower the percentage of people who must be afflicted. And we can help those unfortunate in our society who are affected by it through therapy and treatment provided in centers throughout the country.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: ACTION NOW

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing in the July-August issue of *Rally* entitled "The Great Seniority Struggle: Can Congress Survive as a Co-Equal Branch?" by Donald Lambro.

On January 10 this year I introduced a bill, H.R. 96 to amend the rules of the House to provide for the election of committee chairmen by secret ballot of the members of each committee. My bill embodies the proposal put forward by the prestigious American Assembly of Columbia University, by my former colleague John Lindsay, who researched this subject for our Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform, and by others knowledgeable on this subject as perhaps the fairest and most workable alternative to the present method of selecting committee chairmen purely on the basis of longevity.

In matters of courtesy such as the assignment of room space, I think that reliance on seniority is probably as equitable and practical a system as could be devised. But on the question of choosing who shall be the chairman of each of the important standing and special committees of the U.S. Congress, it seems to me that we ought to be governed by a higher law of logic than that which says that the fellow who has been around the longest shall therefore exercise the greatest authority.

Obviously, I do not agree with Mr. Lambro's conclusion. But he is a hard-working scholar, and I commend his contribution to the literature on this subject. His article is well worth reading, and I hope that its appearance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will help to advance the dialog on congressional reform.

As an immediate proposition, I urge the leadership to schedule S. 355, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967, for action by the House of Representatives. This modest piece of reform legislation, passed by an overwhelming vote of the Senate, has been bottled up in the Rules Committee approaching 7 months. Although much will remain to be done, this bill contains many provisions for the modernization of our institutions that are critically overdue and should be promptly enacted.

THE GREAT SENIORITY STRUGGLE—CAN CONGRESS SURVIVE AS A CO-EQUAL BRANCH?

(By Donald Lambro)

Washington columnist William S. White likes to recall an incident that occurred at the platform committee proceeding of the 1966 Democratic convention. Nearly the entire day had been given over to complaints against the seniority system in Congress. But after the last witness had his say, Rep. John W. McCormack, who is now Speaker of the House, rose to make some concluding remarks. Warmly placing his arm around Negro Congressman William Dawson of Illinois, he told the delegates that he understood and sympathized with their positions. But, he added, there was inside the House an actuality of experience they did not understand.

"You see," he said, "if it were not for the seniority system in the House I am bound to tell you that I very much doubt that my friend Bill Dawson would today be the chairman of a House committee."

Each year various liberals suggest schemes to replace "The System" as the method of selecting committee chairmen. Ex-Senators

Lehman, Humphrey and Douglas, and their colleagues, have repeatedly attempted to substitute almost anything for the present system of advancement through longevity.

In recent years the campaign has been intensified by "reformers" both in and out of Congress. Professor James MacGregor Burns is the foremost academician with blueprints for leveling "obstructionist" legislative hurdles. Senator Joseph Clark (*The Sapless Branch*) and Rep. Richard Bolling (*House Out of Order*) head the congressional opponents of the system.

Our purpose here is to examine the merits of the seniority system in the hope that its remarkable assets will be more fully recognized. According to Dr. George Galloway, House historian, seniority has been entrenched in the Senate for well over a century, but arose in the House only 56 years ago. Liberals have consequently assumed the system to be more tenuous in the House, but almost beyond removal in the Senate, and have concentrated their fire on the lower chamber. The resurgence of a Republican "sentiment" in the House as a result of the 1966 elections has dampened, but not extinguished, their ardor. Seniority is still at the top of the liberals' list.

The seniority system is merely a reflection of the customs and procedures of Congress. "States' rights, local elections, restricted franchise, minority rights, rural over-representation, checks and balances, congressional power, the danger of majority or 'mass' rule, judicial review (at least in the old days), powerful committees, the seniority system, the filibuster—in short, the Madisonian system in all its ramifications—arouse their [conservatives'] support," wrote Professor Burns.

In his "brilliantly wrong book," *Deadlock of Democracy*, written several years before the legendary 89th Congress enacted a flood of welfare legislation, Burns complained of a deadlock in the political machinery of our national government. Nothing was happening in Washington, he said, and nothing happens out in the country unless something happens in Washington. Something, anything, must be done. The White House would ship bushels of bills to Capitol Hill, but Congress slowly and methodically sifted everything, permitting only a few to become law. This is what the Massachusetts professor called the "deadlock" and he reasoned that it was caused by "obstructionism" in Congress—i.e., committee chairmen, House rules, and off-year elections.

Burns then proposed a tidy scheme to permit the liberals, whom he calls the Presidential Democrats and Presidential Republicans, to seize the two parties. If both parties were liberal, he reasoned, the outcome in Congress would be as delightful (liberal) as the presidential elections which, he said, were always a race between leftward-thinking candidates. In each house, he continued, there would be the Presidential Party (Republicans and Democrats supporting the President's program) and the Congressional Party (Republicans and Democrats who oppose the White House program). The professor is obviously eager to expand the strength of the former and undermine the latter.

"What it takes," he wrote, "is majority support for changes in Congress, determination, parliamentary resourcefulness, and persistence. . . . [S]upported by a Johnson or a Nelson Rockefeller in the White House, the presidential party in Congress should pool its strength with the other presidential party to strengthen both Senate and House."

When the reformers talk of "strengthening" Congress, they do not mean it in the traditional check-and-balance sense of renewing legislative prerogatives vis-a-vis the executive. A "strengthened" Congress is one subservient to the presidency, a Congress

composed of liberals; a Congress whose committees are controlled by cooperative people.

Conservative Professor Willmoore Kendall underscores the Machiavellianism of Mr. Burns' proposal for a congressional coup d'état. "Give Mr. Burns and his friends a free hand with our political machinery," he argued in their Pasadena debate, "let them do a little tinkering with it, and everything will come out all right! All of which is to say, Mr. Burns and his friends will then get their way in American politics: the White House program will be adopted and all good things will be added unto us."

It is apparent, on close examination, that the seniority system does govern the "procedures and organization as well as the selection of committee chairmen." "It is perhaps worth remarking," James Burnham wrote, "that this is also true of all other legislative bodies (state and municipal) in the United States, though it is only in connection with Congress that the issue has excited much public debate."

"Unquestionably, as a glance at any session's roster of committee chairmen proves, seniority upsets the plebiscitary relations in favor of age, of social stability in the constituencies, of southern and normally one-party states against more volatile regions, and of farming or small town districts against the big cities."

And it is through these key districts, these safe seats, that those congressmen establish their tenure and accumulate years of service and knowledge—an internship that frequently transforms freshmen into seniors, novices into experts, and congressmen into statesmen.

However, the facts do not altogether mesh with the myth that nearly all committee chairmen are conservative southern Democrats who hail from backward rural areas and seldom vote with their own party.

For example, of the twenty House standing committee chairmen in the 90th Congress only three have an Americans for Constitutional Action rating above 60%; Colmer, 80%; Burleson, 74%; and McMillan, 65%. Thirteen out of the 20 have an ACA rating of 30% or less. Americans for Democratic Action scores correspond inversely to these percentages. Committee chairmanships have hardly been usurped by conservatives.

Of the 20 standing committee chairmen, 6 come from the south, 5 from the north, 2 from border states, 2 from the west, and 5 from the southwest.

New York Times commentator Arthur Krock, writing in the Jan. 22 *Sunday Times Magazine*, vigorously defended the seniority system after a lifetime of observing it in action. Some of his observations, however, are not totally accurate. Rather, he seemed to reinforce the myth that committee chairmen almost overwhelmingly belong to a rural America of yesterday. A close look at the facts suggests that those who have arrived at this conclusion are in error.

Nine House committee chairmen can definitely be placed in the rural column: Mills, Teague, Willis, Colmer, Staggers, Aspinall, Burleson, McMillan and Rivers. However, 7 chairmen are solidly in the urban column: Miller, Fallon, Dulski, Garmatz, Celler, Dawson, and Morgan. More important, though, 4 of these standing committee chairmen come from what can accurately be described as semirural areas which have through the years felt the impact of industrial expansion and the influx of large numbers of people. For instance, Rep. George H. Mahon (Appropriations) comes from Lubbock, Texas, with a population of over 181,000, and can hardly be called a rural congressman. Rep. W. R. Poage of Waco, Texas, comes from a rapidly expanding district. Waco's population exceeds 170,000. Another Texas chairman, Wright Patman, from industrially expanding Texarkana (pop. 99,000) obviously fails to qualify in the rural column. Rep. Carl D.

Perkins of Kentucky has several rapidly growing metropolitan areas in his once-lethargic district. The point is, that population and industrial growth are rapidly urbanizing a number of rural districts. Thus only nine of twenty chairmen can be described as rural-oriented, and some of these districts are changing rapidly.

The record of party support among House committee chairmen is, surprisingly, quite good. The notion that they are renegade mavericks who constantly bolt their party leadership is just so much mythology. Fully half of the standing committee chairmen of the present Congress supported their party during the 89th Congress more than 75% of the time. Of the remaining ten chairmen, four supported their party leadership more than 50% of the time. The remaining six supported their party an average of 27% of the time. All these statistics simply do not support the theory that seniority is a major factor in congressional resistance to White House proposals.

Committee chairmen wield considerable authority over the affairs of their committees and the subcommittees beneath them. But in most cases they are not the iron-fisted despots portrayed by various pundits and political scientists. They direct committee affairs in much the manner that executives in any complex organization oversee operations.

But just what is it that gives chairmen their power? Let's run down the list. They arrange the agenda; appoint subcommittees; designate chairmen; refer legislative matters to the subcommittees; decide when the committee is to meet; whether or not to hold hearing; approve the list of witnesses; hire the staff; decide what and when to investigate; manage legislation on the floor; decide when the committee is to vote; open and close committee debate; and decide whether hearings will be open or executive. They can, if they wish, pigeonhole legislation or speed up action on it, or amend it substantially with assistance from committee colleagues.

It is argued that these are extraordinary powers, inconsistent with modern democracy and efficiency. But this argument ignores the broad spectrum of checks on the chairman's power. A simple majority vote by the House can bring to the floor any bill being stalled in committee. A simple procedure known as Calendar Wednesday can also pry loose a bill from a reluctant committee chairman. And in almost every instance the Speaker (now that the 21-day rule has been repealed) can request the chairman to report a bill from committee. Several other maneuvers are also available. Often the chairman himself establishes clear rules of procedure and scheduling to protect the committee from arbitrary rules and dilatory maneuvers.

Seniority is not a rigid system that invariably elevates long-term incompetents to authority. It can at times be extremely flexible, often resolving problems and tie-ups with amazing speed and smoothness. No one was surprised, for instance, when the late Sen. Theodore Green (D-R.I.) relinquished his chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1959 even though he continued as that committee's highest ranking member. He was eminently qualified, but because of age he was no longer able to handle the enormous workload of committee business. The younger Mr. Fulbright automatically took command. There have been several instances where congressmen have switched committee positions to enable each man to work in a field in which he had greater competence and interest.

Often the House has carefully circumvented seniority to patch a break in the congressional machinery without disrupting the system itself. R. Ewing Thomason, who later became a federal judge in Texas, was the actual chairman during the early postwar period of the now-defunct House Committee

on Military Affairs. The Chairman by seniority, however, was Andrew May of Kentucky, who later got into trouble with the government over influence peddling. The entire House knew about Thomason's *de facto* control of the committee, but not a word was uttered about it outside the caucus rooms. The seniority ranking, on the surface, was left untouched.

The removal of Rep. Adam Clayton Powell from his chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee is still another example of the power to override the system and punish members who flout House standards. The Powell case provides a modern example of the flexibility with which Congress operates.

Though the House and Senate have been reluctant to weaken the prerogatives of seniority, they have at times sternly punished those who have misused the system. Only a few years ago a liberal faction of the Democratic Party successfully purged Rep. Albert Watson (S.C.) and John Bell Williams (Miss.) of their seniority for supporting the candidacy of Barry M. Goldwater in 1964. During the 69th Congress, in 1925, Wisconsin Republicans John M. Nelson and Florian Lampert were purged of their seniority after campaigning as La Follette Progressives in the 1924 elections. Both were committee chairmen, and they and the entire Wisconsin delegation were quickly dropped to the bottom of the seniority ladder of their party.

Still earlier, Rep. John Randolph of Virginia lost his chairmanship of the Ways and Means Committee in 1807 for what was described as "eccentric and arbitrary behavior." He apparently didn't learn his lesson, for several years later he was bodily evicted from the chamber by Speaker Henry Clay for bringing a pair of hunting dogs onto the House floor.

The point is, the orderly workings of the seniority system have not coerced the members into becoming its servants. Rather, the system's uniqueness is that it serves its members well, year in and year out.

Heinz Evlau, writing for the American Enterprise Institute, argues that "as a legislator comes to specialize, he tends to become an expert in his area of specialization. But this in turn presupposes that he has sufficient opportunity to become familiar with the often highly technical aspects of modern legislation. This he cannot do if his committee tenure is of short duration. From this vantage point at least, there is much to be said for retaining seniority as a criterion in guiding committee assignments."

Few defenders of the existing system argue that it is always beneficial. "There is rarely a time," writes William S. White, "when some dunderhead is not at the head of some committee by the mere inexorable workings of seniority." This, however, proves to be the exception in both chambers, where scores of committees and 535 men and women figure in a complicated hierarchical system. It is also true that on many committees legislators of extraordinary talent and wisdom are influential, even though they have achieved no specific hierarchical status.

Other ways have been suggested of selecting committee chairmen, but, as White observes, none of them is a viable alternative to seniority. The most frequently suggested reform—that committee members should elect their own chairmen—would plunge the system into a three-ring circus of logrolling and vote-trading: You give me a vote here and I will give you a vote on that bill of yours. Such infighting "would produce a lobbying chaos . . . in which 'outside' pressures, not all of the necessarily beneficent and forward-looking and disinterested, could simply tear the place apart."

"Nor could there possibly be any objective standard upon which objective men could rely," White adds.

When members are repeatedly returned to

their seats they begin to feel the fruits of seniority and their objections to it gradually lessen. Most members have more faith in committee chairmen than the reformers do—a conviction that these senior members know best how to run Congress.

Seniority survives because none of the proposed alternatives seems as likely to serve as well in selecting the right men. White points out that Congress "is no more able—even if it were willing, as it is not now and never will be—to repeal the claims of seniority than any human enterprise is able to repeal the claims of the synonyms of seniority: experience, capacity, earned prestige, personal influence through personal power."

Seniority is essentially the strength of Congress. It ensures that the personal power and prestige of the men who run the committees shall not fall aimlessly into inexperienced hands, into the laps of wild-eyed reformers eager to manufacture a new set of social reforms, or aid the progressive erosion of congressional power by becoming the adjutors of the "presidential party." And, too, seniority enhances the quality of legislation by requiring that congressional leaders absorb a long series of lessons about laws, men, and justice. And it further requires that such individuals merit the support and earn the approval of their constituents.

"What the defenders of the seniority rule are really saying," Burns admits, "is that given our present congressional party system, a seniority rule is inevitable. And in this they are correct. By the same token, an end of the rule depends on the end of the system."

To this William White replies that "any reform of the kind proposed by Burns and by a good many others would within five years of its acceptance be no reform at all. The realities of legislative life . . . will not accommodate themselves to theoretical designs resting upon such splendid abstractions as 'progressive . . . forward-looking'—designs formed far from the scene of daily action."

But the point is that the reformers are slowly gaining ground. Those who favor essentially the present system must gird themselves for a lengthy siege.

GOVERNMENT SERVICES TO COMMERCIAL BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point an interesting series of correspondence which I have had with a commercial banker on the subject of free services provided by commercial banks to the Government. Too often it is overlooked that banks are the ones who enjoy a bonanza at the expense of the American taxpayer, particularly with respect to the \$2.5 billion of interest-free funds that banks hold in their Treasury tax and loan accounts, and I have urged for many years that this free ride be ended.

As I pointed out in my letter to Mr. Smith, member banks of the Federal Reserve System are examined free of charge. Commercial banks can build up a bad debt reserve of 2.4 percent of outstanding loans. Since 1956 this has enabled the commercial banks to write off about \$2,442 million more against loan income than actual loan losses that amounted to \$1,563 million. As you can

see, this is quite a tax subsidy. Commercial banks during 1965 had net losses on loans of about \$324 million but they wrote off roughly \$781 million from taxable income. That writeoff reduced their Federal income taxes by more than \$203 million in only 1 year; that is about 26 percent on \$781 million. Of course, other businesses pay a rate of about 50 percent and some of your biggest banks pay on a rate as low as 14 or 15 percent. The prestigious Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.'s rate was less than 19 percent in 1966.

The common trust fund in a commercial bank's trust department is completely tax exempt, another huge subsidy that commercial banks enjoy. And, of course, interest paid on time deposits are tax free and the tax-exempt municipal bonds, of which commercial banks hold a huge bulk, are not taxable. Banks also enjoy long-term capital gains on securities at the favorable rate of 25 percent. Losses on securities are used to offset ordinary income which would otherwise be taxable at the 48-percent corporate income tax rate.

The greatest gift to the commercial banking industry by the Government is their ability to create money on the credit of the Federal Government free of all charge by the fractional reserve system. The interest charged on loans which result from the fractional reserve privilege is also part of a commercial bank's profit.

Mr. L. D. Smith, of the Marine Bank & Trust Co., of Tampa, Fla., has outlined his case in the following letter to which my letter of April 10 responds:

MARINE BANK & TRUST CO.,

Tampa, Fla., April 4, 1967.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Your reply of March 20 to my letter of March 14, 1967 is interesting but hardly reassuring.

You ask me to be specific, in extension of comments in my earlier letter referring somewhat critically to some of your positions and actions which have been held to be less statesmanlike than might have been expected from one with your long experience and rank in Congress.

I shall be specific, at this time, on only one subject.

From time to time, you have undertaken to have the Treasury Department require the payment of interest by banks on Treasury Tax and Loan deposits.

I feel, strongly that you are unaware of, or, perhaps, are not making due allowance for, the fact that the commercial banks render invaluable, extensive, continuous, and skilled service to the public and to the Treasury, the cost of which to the government, if paid for commensurably with going rates for professional service of such a high order, would be shocking to those now obtaining such service practically free. It would be surprising, to you probably, if it could be arrived at.

The number, extent, variety and exacting nature of such services is little understood or adequately appreciated, even by the Treasury Department, in my opinion.

I refer, particularly, to the services rendered to the Treasury Department in issuing, redeeming, and obtaining the reissuance of U.S. Savings bonds for the holders.

The only direct and tangible compensation banks receive for this continuous and exacting service is the small fee they are paid for redeeming (over the counter) sav-

ings bonds, Series E, and whatever small profit can be earned from their Treasury Tax and Loan accounts. These balances have to be secured with collateral, they are demand deposits, and are withdrawn at the Treasury's pleasure (which means that they are usually left for rather short periods). This seems to be especially true these days, in view of the heavy calls on the Treasury, due to the war effort and constantly expanding government on all other fronts. It also seems to me that the tempo of withdrawals very probably has been increased, either intentionally or unconsciously since you uttered your more recent criticisms and charges that the banks are being unduly enriched at the public's expense thru Tax and Loan deposits.

There is a basic law that banks may not pay interest on demand deposits, which you should bear in mind. Furthermore, the banks have the duty and responsibility of collecting the taxes and proceeds from the sale of government securities, and accounting for them according to rigid rules. This involves much service.

The service extended, in advising with existing and potential holders of government securities, particularly savings bonds, is surprising and its extent is largely unknown to any except those directly involved in dealing with the public. Redemptions, except the simplest, have to be forwarded to a Fiscal Agent, or to Chicago or to the Treasury, which involves considerable work and expense. Usually, there is delay, at which the bondholder fumes.

The unusual and varied nature of many of these transactions requires that someone with long experience handle them. This means considerable expense to the bank. No two transactions seem to be alike, and it is amazing how involved and troublesome some of them are.

Recently, it has occurred to me that I have been handling such matters ever since the first Liberty Loan bonds were issued, about the time of World War I, and I do not recall that the two banks with which I have been connected during all that time have ever received more than very scant thanks, nor can I recall that I, personally, have ever received the first word of thanks from anyone connected with the government. Of course, I expected none, wanting only to serve the government, too much of the time because it was at war, declared or otherwise, and to serve the public because somehow, the public looks to the banks (as the banks would have it) for financial guidance and assistance.

It does seem, however, that the banks might be compensated better, rather than worse, and that at least some sparse words of thanks might be in order now and then.

Yours very truly,

L. D. SMITH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1967.

Mr. L. D. SMITH,
Marine Bank & Trust Co.,
Tampa, Fla.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Thank you for your letter of April 4 concerning the free use by commercial banks of public funds. I fully agree that commercial banks should be compensated for any and all services to the public. I further believe that interest should be paid on the approximately \$5 billion annual average balance in the Treasury Tax and Loan accounts.

I should also remind you that the Marine Bank & Trust Company is examined by the Federal Reserve System free of charge to you. Also, the annual additions to your bad debt reserve of 2.4 percent are roughly 15 or 16 times the industry's actual loss experience. The difference represents a huge tax subsidy. Furthermore, your common trust fund in your trust department, if you have one, is completely tax-exempt. Also, you can deduct

the interest paid on time deposits and buy tax-exempt municipal bonds. Also, your long-term gains on securities are taxed at the favorable 25 percent rate, while any losses may be used to off-set ordinary income otherwise taxable at the 48 percent rate—another instance of tax favoritism toward banks.

Furthermore, you are permitted to create money on the credit of the government free of charge, by the fractional reserve privilege, and keep for yourself all the interest charged consumers, small businessmen, and other borrowers.

In conclusion, it would seem to me that any alleged subsidy the banking industry gives to the government is far outweighed by the subsidy the banking industry receives from the government as indicated above.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

TEXAS SCHOOL OFFICIAL BLAMES COLLEGES FOR SLOWDOWN IN STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the guaranteed student loan program, authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, has not been as successful as had been anticipated.

One of the reasons I have suggested for the slowdown is that commercial banks have been slow to go into this program. In recent weeks, the American Bankers Association has made it clear that it is demanding a \$35 fee from the Government for each loan made before it will put its mark of stamp of approval.

Mr. L. E. Boze, assistant superintendent of the Grand Prairie Public Schools, has suggested a supplemental reason for the lag in college loans. While pointing out that the Grand Prairie State Bank has been extremely cooperative in making student loans, Mr. Boze suggests that the trouble lies with the colleges and universities. In a letter to me, Mr. Boze wrote:

They (the colleges and universities) simply will not tell the students, public school people, (counselors and principals) the availability of such loans. We have found it next to impossible to even find that such a loan is possible for a college student to obtain.

I am including in my remarks a copy of Mr. Boze's letter so that when hearings on the student guarantee loan program are resumed by the House Education and Labor Committee, members will have the opportunity to consider Mr. Boze's feelings:

GRAND PRAIRIE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Grand Prairie, Tex., September 20, 1967.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I read with interest an article in the Dallas Morning News concerning, "United Student Aid Funds, Inc.". I am sure through the publication of this article more students, parents, administrators and counselors are better informed about this project. I think your remarks have merit, and may encourage more banks to make these funds available to college students. I would like to thank you for this.

I thought you would like to know that the Grand Prairie State Bank has made such loans available to our students. Mr. Durwood Sutton, President, has taken a personal interest in making these loans. I might suggest that if more bankers were better informed and that these forms be simplified to the extent that it would not be so difficult for the banks to meet the requirements to make these loans, it would help. Mr. Sutton, personally, spent many hours in studying these forms and requirements. He made several telephone calls to the numerous colleges and universities as well as to the fund headquarters in New York, in order to get all the information needed to complete the applications. It was most difficult to get all information necessary from the colleges and universities.

I feel the trouble lies with the colleges and universities, rather than the banks. They simply will not tell the students, public school people, (counselors and principals) the availability of such loans. We have found it next to impossible to even find that such a loan is possible for a college student to obtain.

If you could help us with the colleges and universities in getting this information to all public schools, it would be most helpful.

Sincerely yours,

L. E. Boze,
Assistant Superintendent.

GRAND JURORS CHARGE CURBS IN CRIME FIGHT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a grateful feeling toward the recently adjourned grand jury for the District of Columbia that I read into the RECORD a news item from the Washington Post of September 28, 1967. It is on the third page of section B, but deserved a place on the front page of the first section.

It refers to the unanimous action of the grand jurors in writing a letter which should lay at rest the idea in the minds of some, if not most of officialdom, that the Negro population does not want the laws enforced. The composition of this grand jury was predominantly Negro, and its members unanimously soundly condemned the handcuffing of law enforcement in the District of Columbia. I commend them for their courageous action.

The article referred to follows:

GRAND JURORS CHARGE CURBS IN CRIME FIGHT

The outgoing Grand Jury No. 1 for the District of Columbia, in an unprecedented move, yesterday sent a letter to the editor of The Washington Post strongly attacking what it called the limitations imposed upon police, prosecutors and judges in their fight against crime.

The letter was signed by 19 of the 23 members of the jury with a notation that the remaining four, although unable to be present at its composition, gave their approval to its contents.

It stated in part that "we feel the pendulum has swung too far. After two months of duty we find ourselves amazed and shocked at the exaggerated consideration given those who roam our streets indulging themselves in acts of the most outrageous nature."

"If you happen to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one or a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom."

Officials of the U.S. Attorney's office said that the letter had been drafted and sent without their knowledge or consent.

Strictly speaking, a grand jury is prohibited from taking such an action. Each juror is under oath not to discuss any phase of his activities or cases he hears inside the grand jury room.

The jury was dismissed Monday after sitting five days a week for eight weeks. It was predominantly Negro in composition.

A BILLION DOLLARS

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's insurance industry has demonstrated its confidence in the efficacy of the rent supplemental program. Most of the initial portions of the \$1 billion they have pledged to invest in rebuilding slum areas is slated to go into housing for tenants eligible to receive rent supplements. Surely, Congress will not turn its back on this industrywide project and the Nation's poor by rejecting funds to continue the recent supplement program.

As the Baltimore Sun noted in a recent editorial, the \$1 billion will provide as many as 80,000 dwelling units. However, urban renewal and highway construction alone destroy more units than this each year. We need closer to 2 million new housing units per year, most of them for low-income families. The insurance industry has taken a promising first step. Congress must join in the battle too.

Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

A BILLION DOLLARS

Life insurance companies plan to invest \$1 billion in housing mortgages in city slums. This will be a good start, but more will be needed. A billion dollars will provide maybe 80,000 dwelling units. Urban renewal and highway building destroy more units than that each year. A building association official says there is a need for two million new dwelling units a year, much of it for the poor, but there has never been a two million-unit year. This year only 1.2 million units will be built.

According to the 1960 census there were 10.6 million units of substandard housing, 4.3 million in urban places. The percentage of substandard housing in most cities had decreased by 1965, but that is for the city or metropolitan area as a whole. In the slums, if Watts is typical, the situation is worse than in 1960: dilapidated units up from 3 to 5 per cent in five years, deteriorating units up from 12 to 28 per cent, according to a special census.

The insurance companies, and the Johnson Administration, are to be applauded for the new plan. Money is the catalyst slums need. Private money is desperately needed. There could never be enough Government money. David Rockefeller estimates the need at five private dollars for every one public dollar. The importance of the insurance companies' announcement is that it signifies

faith that money can be profitably put to use in areas increasingly shunned by big investors. If the experiment works, other giant financial institutions could be expected to follow.

SUPPORT FOR S. 780

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to draw the attention of the Members to the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has recently concluded hearings on air pollution control legislation and has reported a bill on this subject to the House, S. 780.

The public has—rightly so, in my opinion—become increasingly concerned about the steady deterioration of the quality of our atmosphere. The President gave voice to these feelings in his message to the Congress last January 30 when he said:

This situation does not exist because it was inevitable, nor because it cannot be controlled. Air pollution is the inevitable consequence of neglect. It can be controlled when that neglect is no longer tolerated.

The people of this country are demanding an end to such neglect. The reasons for their attitude are numerous. The most important reason, in my view, is that air pollution is a menace to the health of our citizens in many parts of the Nation. The Surgeon General, Dr. William H. Stewart, in testimony to the committee, detailed some of the adverse medical consequences of breathing polluted air. He pointed out that air pollution is associated with many chronic respiratory diseases; including emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer. Air pollution also corrodes and destroys property, limits visibility, and depresses the human spirit.

The legislation reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would provide a basis for bold new efforts to combat this problem. In line with the President's recommendations, it would afford new impetus to joint action by the Federal Government, States, localities, industry, and concerned citizens. Such a concerted attack on the problem is to be welcomed. I am particularly pleased by provisions which would place major responsibility upon the Governors of the States and at the same time expand the support and guidance to be furnished the States by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In my opinion, prompt approval of the new air pollution legislation by the House will be a major step to protect the interests of the American people and I urge all my colleagues to support S. 780.

STRONG MOVES FOR AIR SAFETY

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer of September 21 compliments the Federal Aviation Administration for stiffening air safety rules to hold down chances of fires aboard planes that make crash landings and to speed passenger exit from planes under these circumstances.

The Inquirer notes that this move complements President Johnson's call for a new program of air safety, and his own budget amendment, now before the Senate, for several hundred additional air traffic controllers on the FAA staff.

The Administration should be complimented for such timely action aimed at keeping pace with the unprecedented growth in air travel. By these moves, many lives have been saved.

I insert the Inquirer editorial in the RECORD at this point:

STRONG MOVES FOR AIR SAFETY

Everyone who uses the commercial airlines, or expects to use them, has a personal stake in the move by the Federal Aviation Administration to stiffen air safety rules aimed at reducing fire dangers and to speed up escape from planes forced to make crash landings.

The new regulations, scheduled to take effect between next October 24 and October 1, 1969, seem to be soundly calculated to save lives and reduce injuries, if not entirely eliminate them in many accidents. Clifford W. Walker, FAA's deputy associate administrator, sums up a great deal in pointing out that after years of development, airlines are being built that "will take a real battering" without serious harm to passengers.

Under such circumstances, it is a life-and-death matter to get passengers out of the aircraft "before fire, fumes or something else gets them." A major requirement is that new planes must have enough exits for a full load of passengers to get out in 90 seconds using exits on only one side. Furthermore, it is to be up to the manufacturers rather than the airline to demonstrate this capability. Present regulations put responsibility on the airline, and allow 120 seconds. Other rule changes facilitate this aim.

All of these requirements seem to make sense. They nicely complement President Johnson's call for a new program of air safety and aviation control in keeping with the increases in aviation activity which, this year alone, have been double the anticipated rate. The more stringent requirements will mean little, however, unless matched by adequate air traffic controls, airport safety equipment and safety personnel in the field.

DAY CARE PROGRAM

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I introduced H.R. 13194, a bill to provide day care for children from low-income families, and for other purposes. This bill would amend title V of the

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The language in my bill is the same as that now being considered by the Senate during its debate on proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. It is important, in my opinion, that this proposal be debated fully in the House as well.

There is no question that improved day care programs, particularly for the children of low-income families, are needed in the United States. As the report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare points out, one of the few poverty groups that have increased in size in recent years have been families headed by females. An effective day care program could become a real means for such women to achieve self-sufficiency. Following is the section of the Senate committee report on the program:

DAY CARE PROGRAM

A. FINDINGS

Poor families with female heads are one of the few poverty groups which have increased in size during the past 7 years. The number of children living in such families grew from 4 million in 1960 to 4.4 million in 1966. This increase occurred mostly among families with five or more children.

There are two means through which these families can escape poverty. One is through an income-maintenance program—by increasing payments under public assistance or by adopting an alternative program, such as a family allowance or negative income tax. The other is to provide training and employment opportunities so that the mothers are able to support their families, but to do this would require child-care services when the mother is at work.

The income maintenance approach has not been considered by the committee but the latter type of approach is within our current interest because the various training and job-creation programs contained in the committee bill will offer new opportunities to these women.

The committee believes that mothers should have a meaningful choice between adequate income support and employment, including combinations of the two. They should be neither forced to work nor denied the opportunity to gain employment. But if they choose to work, they should be assured that their children will receive proper care.

Throughout the country the committee has heard statements about the insufficiency of day-care programs. This testimony has come from civic leaders, professional social workers, and poor persons who would utilize such services if available. A modest program for Federal assistance for day care is contained in the Social Security Act, and Congress is considering amendments to expand this activity. However, this program is administered solely by Departments of Welfare and is aimed primarily at families which receive public assistance, and therefore excludes hundreds of thousands of poor families which could utilize a day-care program as a means of achieving self-sufficiency.

The committee, therefore, recommends a new day-care program as part B of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Purpose

The purpose of the program would be to provide day care for children from low-income families or other families residing in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons. This would enable parents or relatives of such children to undertake or continue vocational training, basic education, or gain-

ful employment. It is intended that the program focus primarily on children of those persons who are entering training and advancing to employment and that it should be used to fill the interstices not covered by other day-care programs (sec. 521).

2. Financial Assistance

The bill authorizes the Director to make grants to appropriate public agencies and private organizations for day-care programs, including health, education, social, and other supportive services, and the costs of renovation and alteration of physical facilities, if necessary (sec. 522(a)). Federal assistance may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of such programs. If appropriate, such assistance may be provided in conjunction with or supplementary to other federally aided day-care programs.

3. Participants

Preference should be given to children from poor families or families in poverty areas whose parents or relatives desire to accept employment or to undertake vocational training or basic education under this act or related programs (sec. 522(c)). Where a family is not in the low-income category or through employment rises above the poverty line, that family may be charged part or all of the cost of services received (sec. 522(b)). This is permitted because the committee looks with favor upon a reasonable mixture of income levels and does not feel that a family should be barred from participation when, as a result of work, it is able to rise above the poverty line. Partial payment is allowable because some families cannot afford the full cost since their income will not be very far above the poverty line.

4. Training

An expansion of day care in the United States will require additional trained personnel. To meet this need, the bill requires that training be provided to welfare recipients and other low-income persons so that they can fill the new jobs which are created.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 13194

A bill to provide day care for children from low-income families, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. For the purpose of carrying out programs under this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$35,000,000.

DAY CARE PROJECTS

SEC. 2. Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new part at the end thereof:

"PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day care for children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons in order to enable the parents or relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to continue vocational training, basic education, or gainful employment.

"GRANTS FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

"SEC. 522. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to appropriate public agencies and private organizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of projects under which children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons may receive day care. Such day care projects shall provide health, education, social, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Project costs payable under this part may include costs of

renovation and alternation of physical facilities. Financial assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction with or to supplement day care projects under the Social Security Act or other relevant statutes.

"(b) The Director may require a family which is not a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in part, for the day care services provided under this program where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate.

"(c) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall give preference to projects providing day care for children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons whose parents or relatives desire to accept employment or to undertake vocational training or basic education under this and other Acts.

"(d) The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels. The Director shall give preference to applicants which show evidence of coordination and cooperation between their projects and other day care programs in the areas which they will serve.

"(e) Each project to which payments are made hereunder shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evaluation shall be conducted by such agency or independent public or private organization as the Director shall designate, with a view to determining, among other things, the extent to which the day care provided may have increased the employment of parents and relatives of the children served, the extent to which such day care may have reduced the costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which such children have received health and educational benefits, and the extent to which the project has been coordinated with other day care activities in the area served. Up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this part. Such evaluations, together with a report on the program described in this part, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

"TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS IN DAY CARE PROJECTS

"SEC. 523. (a) The Director, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps in the operation of vocational training, work experience, and basic education programs under their jurisdiction to train unemployed or low-income individuals in day care projects under this part.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall give preference to projects in which unemployed or low-income individuals are to be employed including individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance under the Social Security Act.

"DURATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 524. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years."

(b) The heading of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND DAY CARE PROGRAMS"

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following personal requests:

Mr. WHALEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MESKILL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. NELSEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BEVILL (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LENNON (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to raise an issue, that two of the gentlemen that asked for official leave, to be absent from sessions from the House of Representatives, are among those who have been urging the Speaker to have sessions through Saturday, and to start sessions at 11 o'clock in the morning. I would like to know if this really is official business these two gentlemen are engaged upon, or is it some other kind of mission?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the full observation or comment of the gentleman from Ohio, but I would only say this: To my knowledge, in my 19 years here, I have never heard anybody on either side of the aisle challenge the good faith of a Member who was seeking leave of absence on account of official business.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have reserved the right to object. I was wondering if the distinguished minority leader might be able to clear up the question I raised about these gentlemen, who are among those who are very much responsible for our being here on a bill which we could have finished yesterday. They asked for sessions on Friday and Saturday, and they are not here today, and now they have asked for official leave of absence. I think this is a perfectly bona fide request, and I would like

to know, I would like to be assured they are truly involved in something that relates to the business of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat a little differently what I said a moment ago: We have never challenged the veracity of a Member who asked for a leave of absence or the basis on which a Member asked for leave of absence based on the signature of the leader. We do not intend to in the future. We have to do a great deal of business in this Chamber based on faith and trust in one another. I assume when a Member on this side of the aisle asks for a leave of absence on account of official business, that it is for a legitimate purpose. I do not know in this particular case the precise details, but I would suggest the gentleman make his inquiry to the Chair and not to me.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to assume the two gentlemen in question are on official business and that the letter they sent was a little pleasant demagoguery which did not add too much to anything.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my opposition, but I think the point has been made. I certainly appreciate the position of the majority leader and the minority leader when they submit these requests on behalf of Members. I think the 28 signers of the letter complaining about slowness of business in the House of Representatives have, in effect, questioned the actions of the entire House of Representatives. I think, insofar as they have done this, and tried to discipline the entire House, they themselves are subject to question in their motives and in their own attendance records in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The several personal requests were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. McFALL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. MILLER of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 2, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

CXIII—1721—Part 20

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1112. A letter from the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting copies of reports of every institution, organization, corporation or association other than the United States Government, government of the District of Columbia, and foreign governments, owning property exempt under provisions of the act defining the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 77-846; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1113. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipt of project proposals, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1114. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report on a certain case involving suspension of deportation, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1115. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of receipts and expenditures for fiscal year 1967, pursuant to the provisions of 43 U.S.C. 1331, et seq.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1116. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 11, 1967, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Point Roberts, Wash., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 14, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

1117. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 25, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on Calcasieu River and Pass, La., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 29, 1962; to the Committee on Public Works.

1118. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 13237. A bill to amend title 46, section 1159, to provide for construction aid for certain vessels operating on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 13238. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13239. A bill to amend section 4063 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 13240. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 13241. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize certain grants for rehabilitation of the lakes of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 13242. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to provide insurance thereunder of loans made for the purchase of dwelling units in cooperative housing projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13243. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require that any rental or cooperative housing constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area shall be designed for low- and middle-income groups; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13244. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to provide that mortgages covering middle-income consumer cooperative housing projects may be insured thereunder up to the full amount of the replacement cost of such projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers, and certain single other persons, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 13246. A bill to amend sections 902(b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 25 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25-percent test is met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 515. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 13247. A bill for the relief of Aiko Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13248. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Di Meglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of our spirits, with a faith that will not shrink though pressed by every foe, we would this day climb the altar steps which lead through darkness up to Thee. For our greatest need is of Thee.

In this day of destiny for us and for the world, make us worthy of our high calling as keepers of the sacred flame.

The arm of flesh is futile. Thine alone, O Lord, is the greatness and the power